THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

Vol.II No.11 December 1960

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East and Africa

---

MIDDLE EAST

Soviet Views on the Middle East Countries traces the development, in recent years, of the Soviet attitude towards each of the principal Middle East countries, and examines the reasons for the caution which is now evident in Soviet writing about the Middle East.

The Middle East in the Soviet Press includes reports on Soviet-Iraqi and Soviet-UAR relations; the main event in this period was the visit to the Soviet Union of the UAR delegation headed by Field-Marshal Amir.

AFRICA

An Introduction to Soviet Writing on Ghana provides a survey of Soviet views on such subjects as the ethnic and class composition of the population of Ghana, the independence movement, progress towards economic independence and Ghana's foreign policy.

Africa in the Soviet Press includes a review of Soviet comment on the Congo situation and an account of Soviet reactions to events in Algeria.

(Note: The index to Volume II of the Mizan Newsletter will be included in the January issue.)

SOVIET VIEWS ON THE MIDDLE EAST COUNTRIES

Soviet views on the regimes of most Middle East countries today are far from straightforward. Of those governments most favoured by the Soviet Union, none has earned unqualified Soviet approval; of the rest, few are regarded as hopelessly committed to wrong policies and incapable of making a fresh start. Soviet accounts of Middle East regimes and political movements today are more cautious and less enthusiastic on the one hand - and less virulent on the other - than two years ago. This is partly the result of the growing direct involvement of the Soviet Union in the concerns of the Middle East countries themselves, with its accompanying political and ideological responsibilities; partly the result of Soviet disillusionment with the course of Arab nationalism; and partly the result of the changes of government in Turkey and Persia, and Soviet hopes for improved relations with these countries.

The foreign policies of Middle East governments - the attitude they adopt in the East-West conflict - are the first criterion in Soviet assessment of their merits. Their attitude towards "progressive reforms" and towards "the progressive patriotic forces" - that is, the Communists - would appear to be a secondary consideration, but it is none the less far from being overlooked in Soviet accounts even of those Middle East countries most friendly to the Soviet Union.

In the following notes on the Soviet attitude towards Middle East countries bracketed numbers refer to sources, which are listed at the end of the article.

UAR The Egyptian revolution, unlike that of Iraq, had no sympathy from the Soviet Union in its inception. It was described in the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia (1952) as the action of a "reactionary officers' group linked with the USA", which had embarked on "savage repression of the workers' movement"(1). Writing in 1953 L.N. Vatolina observed that since the revolution there had been increased persecution of Communists, democrats and trade unionists, and that the peasants had been cheated of their rights by a purely "demagogic" measure of land reform (2). By 1954, however, a less unfavourable view was taken of the Egyptian revolution; reviewing an Arab writer's thesis that the coup d'etat was an expression of class movements directed against reaction and imperialism, A.F. Sultanov questioned this conclusion, but nevertheless conceded that the new land reform law was undoubtedly a progressive measure (3).

Soviet views on Syria similarly underwent a change during this period. In 1952 the Soviet view was that the Syrian Government was following an "anti-popular" and "pro-American" policy, resulting in economic and political oppression and the impoverishment of the working masses (4). After 1954,

however, a more hopeful picture was presented of the Syrian political scene, with particular emphasis on the Syrian Communist Party's role in bringing about a united "anti-imperialist front", and on the strengthening of Soviet-Syrian friendship since 1955 (5).

In the course of 1955 (the year of the Bandung Conference, the Baghdad Pact and the beginning of Soviet economic relations with Egypt following her arms deal with Czechoslovakia) the Egyptian revolutionary regime was firmly rehabilitated in Soviet eyes, and its role in Egypt's "national liberation movement" was acknowledged - although it was emphasized that the only proper leader of the national movement was the preletariat, "the sole revolutionary class consistent to the end" (6). The USSR's support for the Suez Canal nationalization, its immediate and vehement denunciation of the armed action against Egypt in October-November 1956 and its offer of armed support for Egypt ushered in the most enthusiastic phase of Soviet writing about Egypt and the Arab nationalist movement in general. The Soviet Arabist V.B. Lutskiy wrote a most sympathetic theoretical appraisal of the Arab unity movement, in which he declared: "The Arab peoples ... are united by community of political interests which, while not constituting the definition of a nation, immeasurably strengthens national links ... In practice Arab unity does not present great problems. It has been achieved by the Arab peoples in the course of their common national liberation struggle, it has been translated into living reality, and we Soviet people with all our heart wish the Arabs the strengthening of their unity" (7).

Lutskiy's article, however, was the high-water-mark of Soviet support for Arab nationalism. Lutskiy himself soon returned to the theme of working-class leadership, in an article on the significance of the 1957 October Revolution anniversary for the Arab countries. In this he spoke, not of the ideals of Arab nationalism, but of the growth of the working class in the Arab countries; of the spread of socialist ideas; and of what he called "the spontaneous craving for socialism among the Arab masses and all progressive forces in Arab society" (8).

The formation of the UAR, following the plebiscite of 21st February 1958, was applauded by Soviet commentators as a merger based on the common resistance of both countries to imperialism. It was emphasized that the Soviet-Egyptian and Soviet-Syrian economic agreements were of the greatest importance for the development of the young republic's industry. But a cautious note was struck by K. Ivanov (9), who observed that the trends within the Arab unity movement which would "triumph in the long run" would be those "which are most closely associated with the people"; Marxists, he said, did not "make a fetish of Arab unity", which was an idea which could be "used for some time also by the reactionaries, who seek to arrest the progressive development of the Arab peoples". In an article on the occasion of Nasir's visit to the USSR in May 1958 I.P. Belyayev made the similarly cautious comment that the success of the UAR would "be determined

by how broadly the popular masses and all the patriotic forces of the Republic participate in securing their freedom and independence" (10). Obviously the position of the Communists in Syria, as part of the Republic's "patriotic forces", was already a matter of Soviet concern.

It seems that the Iraqi revolution of 14th July 1958 was at first regarded in the Soviet Union - as indeed in other countries - as a new victory for Nasir. On 17th-18th July Khrushchev met Nasir and discussed with him the Middle East situation; and in a speech on 22nd July Khrushchev spoke of the Iraqi revolution as a victory for "the national liberation movement of the Arabs" of which Nasir was the leader (11). But the ensuing split between Cairo and Baghdad, and Nasir's public announcement of an anti-Communist campaign in the UAR, made a Soviet change of position inevitable. In January 1959 Khrushchev openly denounced anti-Communism in the UAR as "a reactionary affair" (12); and in March he alleged that Nasir "insists on the union of Iraq with the UAR", and condemned interpretations of Arab nationalism which went against "the interests of the working people".

During 1959 anti-Communist measures in the UAR, and expressions of anti-Communist sentiment, were frequently reported in the Soviet press (13). They have been less in evidence during 1960. Perhaps some significance should be attached to the observation by Kondrashov, IZVESTIYA's Cairo correspondent, in January 1960, that the Soviet Union could "leave the settlement of ideological controversies to history" (14). An often repeated theme in present Soviet writing about the UAR seems to be "non-interference"; it is emphasized that Soviet aid carries with it no political commitments, and it is implied that Cairo's anti-Communist campaign will not affect the Soviet Union's punctual fulfilment of her undertakings. The professional achievements of Soviet engineers and technicians, particularly on the High Dam project, are constantly extolled. The Soviet public is being made to feel that it can take justified pride in the fine work being done by its representatives, and that they in their turn are working with a sense of mission.

However, this is not to say that ideological divergences have not been aired at all. In the field of foreign policy, the prevalence of the slogan "Neither East nor West" in Arab nationalist circles - the idea that, now that imperialism has been defeated, Communism and the Communist countries are the new enemy of the Arabs - has been sharply denounced, and the UAR has been particularly mentioned in this context (15). In the field of domestic policy, some Soviet journalists have recently drawn attention to the contrast between the aims and ideals of the UAR regime and the actual political and economic realities of the situation. The efficacy of the Government's economic measures, in relation to urban and rural poverty, has been questioned (16). Kondrashov recently made some very ironical comments on the UAR ideal of a "democratic socialist cooperative society"

in an account which he gave of a visit to Asyut, which implied that slogans only had changed and that in essence the people with the money remained on top (17). A Soviet account of new labour legislation in the Syrian region was markedly critical in tone (18).

Meanwhile Soviet writers view with equanimity, and indeed with approval, the development of state capitalism in the UAR. This is regarded as a "progressive" phenomenon since it weakens the position of foreign capital, and since the expansion of the state sector and the development of national planning serve the interests not only of the "national bourgeoisie" but also of the Egyptian people as a whole (19). But the UAR's progress towards the "higher stage" of "socialist transformation of the economy" has not yet been specifically advocated.

Iraq The advent of the Iraqi Republic and its first political, social and economic measures were greeted with enthusiasm by Soviet writers. Today this enthusiasm does not cover so wide a field. It is particularly in evidence in Soviet writing on Soviet-Iraqi friendship, and Iraqi support for Soviet foreign policy; Iraq's plans for industrial and agricultural development, and Soviet assistance in them; and Iraq's rejection of Western alliances and economic aid. But the internal political scene is no longer painted in glowing colours; it is recognized that divisions have arisen in the "national front of progressive forces" of which Soviet writers had so much to say at the time of the Iraqi revolution.

Before the Iraqi revolution Soviet works on Iraq had emphasized the part played by the Iraqi Communist Party in movements for political and economic change (20). Tarik Muhammad, member of the politburo of the Iraqi Communist Party, wrote in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK on the influence of the Iraqi Communist Party and of Communist ideas on the Iraqi people's "liberation struggle" (21). Since the revolution Soviet writers have claimed that part of the credit for the revolution must go to the Communist Party; in carrying out the revolution the Iraqi army "relied on the widest strata of the population, and on the influential democratic organizations, among which the Communist Party occupied a prominent place" (22). A recent Soviet account of the Iraqi revolution says that the ground for it was prepared by the National Front set up in 1956, consisting of the National Democratic, Istiqlal and Ba'th Parties and the underground Communist Party; the National Front formed local committees which "prepared the people for a decisive engagement", and established close contact with the "Free Officers" movement; "the Iraqi patriots, understanding that without the army, especially in the conditions of Iraq, it was impossible to achieve victory over the reactionary regime with its powerful police apparatus, took opportune measures to draw the army to the side of the revolution" (23). The Soviet view is that the army joined and led a revolutionary movement which was already in existence (24).

From the outset the Iraqi revolution was recognized in the USSR - notably by Khrushchev himself (25) - as being "not socialist", but nevertheless "progressive" in character. Early in 1959, Soviet commentators took the view that the great virtue of the Iraqi regime was the freedom it allowed to mass organizations and expressions of mass opinion; "the Government not only hears the voice of the people but obeys it" (26). The prestige of the Iraqi Communist Party, it was stated, was "higher than ever" (27). The wide-scale political activity of the trade unions and of the peasants' societies - "the champions and defenders of revolutionary ideas among the mass of the people" (28) - was particularly noted. By then Iraqi Communists were themselves already voicing indirect criticism of the regime; Salam Adil at the CPSU Congress in Moscow on 2nd February 1960 called for freedom of political activity for the then coalition of the Communist and other parties in the National Union Front (29). But there was no adverse Soviet comment on the "freeze" of party activity in Iraq; the view was taken that the people's voice nevertheless found adequate expression, particularly in the mass organizations (30).

The first Soviet reference to the existence of an anti-Communist faction in the Iraqi Government seems to have been in an article by S. Danilov on the Kirkuk disorders of 14th July 1959; Danilov said that reactionaries, including "some elements from the Iraqi administration who have not got rid as yet of memories of the Nuri as-Sa'id regime", were trying to blame the disorders on "the progressive patriotic forces" - that is, the Communists (31). But, when subsequently the Iraqi Communist Party publicly accepted blame for its "extreme measures", its confession of shortcomings was published in the Soviet press (32) and the picture was presented of a party resolutely determined to "cast aside secondary differences of opinion and to renew cooperation with other different national forces" (33).

However, when the Iraqi Communist Party found its way to official recognition blocked by another party using the same name, its claims received immediate Soviet support. Dawud as-Sa'igh's rival group was called "opportunist and subversive" and "the signboard behind which a small group of people far removed from Communist ideology are hiding" (34). The suppression of the Communist Party organ ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B and the prosecution of its editor was sharply criticized as an "attack on the democratic press" (35).

Meanwhile the trade union movement in Iraq was receiving wide notice in Soviet publications, in articles by Soviet journalists and by Iraqi trade unionists themselves (36). But here also, since 1959, interference by "reaction" has been denounced; the Soviet trade union organ TRUD has published a letter from a Basrah trade unionist denouncing arrests carried out among workers in Basrah and Baghdad, and also Ali Shukr's open letter to Qasim, appearing in ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B, denouncing interference by the authorities in trade union elections (37).

However, all this does not seem to affect in any way the general Soviet approval accorded to the Iraqi Government's economic programme, and the general picture which Soviet writers present of the closest and friendliest relations between the Soviet Union and the Iraqi Republic.

Yemen The friendly relations existing between the Yemen and the Soviet Union are the main consideration in Soviet writing on that country. It is claimed that the popularity today enjoyed by the Russians - and the Czechs and Chinese - in the Yemen gives the lie to "imperialist" assertions that the Yemenis are an unfriendly people (38). The progress of the Soviet project of rebuilding the port of Hudaydah has been publicized in the Soviet press (39).

However, this does not prevent Soviet writers from describing conditions in the Yemen as feudal, with landless peasants at the mercy of large landowners, rudimentary health, welfare and education services, and bad labour conditions. The Soviet orientalist A. Sultanov, who visited the Yemen in January 1958, wrote of his meetings with "representatives of the Yemen's younger generation", who were "burning with the desire to reform the social life of the country and to extirpate the remnants of feudalism which prevent the development of the country's productive forces" (40). But, although Soviet writers have chronicled the growth of a workers' movement in Saudi Arabia, they have not done the same for the Yemen, and the Soviet Union's cordial relations with the Yemeni ruling dynasty would presumably prevent them doing so. Soviet writers speak of the Yemen's "anti-imperialist" movement, but not, as in the case of most other Middle East countries, of any "democratic movement" among the people. The Yemen's claim to Aden and Southern Arabia is noted, and the Aden Protectorates are referred to by Soviet writers, as by Yemeni propagandists, as "the occupied parts of the Yemen"; but Soviet comment on nationalist movements in Aden does not suggest that union with the Yemen should necessarily be one of their objectives.

Saudi Arabia The best account of Soviet views on Saudi Arabia is provided in I.P. Belyayev's AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN SAUDI ARABIA (Moscow 1957). Soviet writers make much of the fact that the Soviet Union was the first country to recognize Ibn Sa'ud's assumption of rule over the Hijaz, after its conquest in 1926. Belyayev says: "Ibn Sa'ud's aim, the creation of a strong, centralized feudal state, accorded with the aspirations to unity and independence shared by the disunited population of the amirates and tribes of Arabia." The Wahhabis, says Belyayev, constituted Saudi Arabia's "national liberation movement" in the years following the first World War, when "the Great October socialist revolution in Russia awakened the oppressed peoples of the East". A.I. Pershits, an authority on the peoples of the Arabian peninsula, wrote in 1955 with approval of Wahhabism's

opposition both to pagan survivals and to excessive Muslim ritual (41); but in 1958 he said that Wahhabism was itself being influenced by "the fresh breeze of the progressive movement in the Arab countries" in the direction of social awakening. Belyayev similarly analyses the institution of the ikhwan in the light of modern conditions: "The military-feudal state of the ikhwan, having played its positive role in the period of the formation of the centralized feudal Wahhabi state, has in our days become a brake on the economic and political development of Saudi Arabia."

The operations of Aramco in Saudi Arabia are depicted in the worst possible light; and "liquidation of the US atomic base in Dahran" is called for. However, as regards the Saudi Government itself, it appears still to be viewed rather as a victim of American designs than as an executant of them; its adherence to a policy of positive neutrality is applauded. In general, Soviet writers have continued to write with sympathy of Saudi affairs, and they deplore the absence of Saudi-Soviet diplomatic relations.

Lebanon Soviet writers depict the Lebanon as, economically, a backward agricultural country dominated by big landlords, with Western influence paramount in trade and industry (42). Constitutionally, the Lebanon is described as "a bourgeois parliamentary republic" (43), in which "the electoral machinery is substantially in the hands of the administration, the local feudal leaders, the heads of religious communities and the trading and banking capitalist leadership" (44). But since 1955 a distinction has been drawn between big bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie in the Lebanon; the former are said to have collaborated with the French, and to have Western (and now pro-American) sympathies, while the latter are said to have participated in the movement for independence are now looked to as providing opposition to political association with the West. Rashid Karame's Government - whose assumption of office in 1958 was enthusiastically hailed as marking the end of "the US invasion" - was praised for "taking steps to reduce the political and economic dependence of the Lebanon on the Western powers" (45). Lebanese abstention from the anti-Communism of the UAR was noted with approval.

Comment on the parliamentary elections of 1960 praised the new electoral law as closing loopholes for "machinations" but complained that the large deposits required for candidates and the high age qualification for voting offset these "democratic improvements". The elections were represented as basically a contest between "two trends, the patriotic and the pro-imperialist". The electoral victories of former leaders of the insurgents were praised, but they were criticized for "restricting the activities of the people's masses", which, it was said, allowed "reactionaries" also to be elected. There was sharp criticism of "reactionaries

from the ranks of the Ba'thists and Arab nationalist extremists, fighting for the inclusion of the Lebanon in the UAR without account of its national peculiarities and democratic traditions" (46).

It seems that at present Soviet writers are content to advocate progressive dissociation of the Lebanon from Western influence, and to express support for the Lebanese Government in so far as they consider it to be bringing this about. On the subject of Soviet-Lebanese economic relations, Soviet writers say much about the benefits of the existing trade agreements and about the prospects for their further development - and, for example, about the assistance which Soviet deliveries could give to the promotion of a Lebanese heavy industry. However, in the absence of any larger initiatives on the Lebanese side, Soviet writers have confined themselves to expressing appreciation of the Lebanese Government's extension of existing trade agreements.

Jordan The results of the Soviet change of attitude towards UAR expansionism are clearly seen in the case of Jordan. The period when Soviet writers gave most attention to Jordan was during the years 1956-7, when the Jordanian rapprochement with Egypt was followed (in April 1957) by the Nabulsi Government's decision to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The subsequent "victory for reaction" in Jordan was regarded as only assured thanks to British intervention; but for this, it was suggested at the time, a union with the UAR might have been brought about (47). But, since Nasir's anti-Communist offensive at the end of 1958, Soviet writers have ceased to depict the "anti-imperialist struggle" in Jordan in terms of the Arab unity movement. Obviously they could hardly favour the union of Jordan with a country in which anti-Communism is no less part of government policy than it is in Jordan. Nor is Jordan's merger in a larger unit regarded as a necessary step; considerable emphasis is laid on the country's economic viability, given proper development of its natural resources. "Popular front" opposition to the present regime is regarded as essential, with the Jordanian Communist Party playing a leading part in this.

Turkey As neighbours of the USSR, both Turkey and Persia have been the object of closer Soviet study, over a longer period, than other Middle East countries. In the case of Turkey, the almost contemporary rise to power of the Soviet and Kemalist revolutions, and the early links between them, made the ideological assessment of Kemalism a particular concern of Soviet writers. It is claimed that the Turkish Revolution would not have been possible without the Russian Revolution; and the friendly relations between the two countries in the 1920s and 1930s are frequently recalled. However, not all Soviet writers during that period regarded the Kemalist regime with favour, and its suppression of the Turkish Communist Party

led at least one Soviet writer to denounce it is "fascist" (48); and a recent considered Soviet view of its merits and demerits affirmed that, while it had a "progressive" side in its fight for national independence against imperialism, it also had a "reactionary tendency" in that it "opposed socialism and acted against the vital needs of the workers and peasants, against the interests of national minorities, and against the democratization of the social system" (49).

The volume of Soviet writing on the subject of the Turkish proletariat is considerable. Working-class opposition to the Kemalist regime has been chronicled, and trade union activity since the war is represented as a continuation of the struggle for workers' rights. With so much to say about the allegedly miserable condition of Turkish workers today, it might be expected that Soviet writers would go on to urge that the workers' prime object should be to secure the formation of a "popular front" government or the introduction of a "democratic" regime. In fact, however, they do not do this. Instead, the plight of the workers and indeed all the ills of the country are blamed on the policy of "militarization"; the remedy, it is urged, is to be found in radical alteration of the country's foreign policy, and peaceful cooperation with all countries, particularly Turkey's neighbours.

The change of government in Turkey, and Gen. Gursel's affirmations about a return to the principles of Ataturk, have produced much hopeful forecasting, in Soviet publications, of a possible improvement of Soviet-Turkish relations. It is pointed out that the Soviet bloc countries offer Turkey a stable market "free from the pernicious influence of crises", a market whose value for Turkey's economy was keenly appreciated in Ataturk's time (50). The promptness with which, since the change of government in Turkey, the Soviet press virtually ceased its former hostile comment on Turkey's affairs and concentrated instead on the theme of improving Soviet-Turkish relations seems to indicate that, in the case of Turkey, good-neighbourly relations take precedence over considerations of Turkey's domestic policy. It is perhaps significant that Soviet writers have not insisted on abandonment of Turkey's Western defence commitments as a necessary prerequisite for the resumption of friendly relations between Turkey and the USSR.

Persia The tenor of Soviet writing on Persia varies - perhaps more so than in the case of any other Middle East country - according to the prevailing climate of diplomatic relations. Although Persia's adherence to the Baghdad Pact in 1955 evoked hostile Soviet comment at the time, the Shah's visit to the USSR in June-July 1956 and the exchanges of parliamentary and other delegations between the two countries were subsequently acclaimed as evidence of the development of good-neighbourly relations between Persia and the USSR; Soviet writings on Persia during

that period were able to end on an optimistic note (51). There was similar friendly comment following the conclusion of a number of economic agreements during 1957 - the long-term Soviet-Persian trade agreement of 16th April, the transit traffic agreement of 25th April, and the agreement of 11th August on joint irrigation and power projects on the frontier rivers Araxes and Atrek (52). In May 1958 a Soviet commentator expressed the view that "of late, despite Western pressure, the Persian Government has pursued a policy in keeping with the national interest"; the conclusion of the AGIP oil agreement, "which is much more favourable for Persia than the earlier agreements imposed by the USA and Britain on eastern countries", was regarded as evidence of this (52).

Persia's conclusion of a bilateral defence agreement with the USA, and her rejection of a proposed treaty of friendship and non-aggression with the USSR, after discussions in Tehran in January-February 1959, were followed by a period of vehemently hostile Soviet press criticism of the Shah's regime. If there was some abatement of this campaign later in the year, it was resumed in 1960, particularly in connection with CENTO air exercises in Persia in May, the execution of "Azarbayjani patriots" in Tabriz on 4th May, and the Persian official attitude to the U-2 aircraft incident.

Throughout August the Soviet press published reports on what it called the "election mockery" in Persia. Initial Soviet comment on the resignation of Eqbal's government represented it as a blow to the Shah's regime. But the possibility of better Soviet relations with the new government was evidently kept in mind. It was noted that the Persian press had been forecasting an improvement in Soviet-Persian relations, and that both the Shah and the new Premier had expressed the desire for friendship with the Soviet Union. There has not been (up to the date of writing) any repetition of the former Soviet press attacks on the Shah's regime.

In conclusion, it would appear that the attitude of the Soviet Union towards individual Middle East Governments is not irrevocably affected by their attitude towards Communism within their own countries or by their acceptance of Western defence commitments; it is rather their own attitude towards the Soviet Union which is the deciding factor. The present Soviet view is evidently that existing Soviet friendships with the uncommitted countries are not to be lightly forfeited for ideological reasons. In a recent PRAVDA article Academician Ye. Zhukov, discussing the bases for Soviet solidarity with "bourgeois" states of Asia and Africa, said that the "bourgeois nationalism" of such states should not be sneered at; to do so amounted to "sectarianism of a most dangerous kind leading to self-isolation" (53). The phrase "self-isolation" seems to carry the conviction of a genuine anxiety. By putting ideological aims first, rather than second, the Soviet Union could lose existing friendships in the Middle East and the chance of new ones. The above notes perhaps show that this has not been done.

References

(1) BOL'SHAYA SOVETSKAYA ENTSIKLOPEDIYA, Vol.15, p.460.

(2) L.N. Vatolina, "Egypt and the Crisis of British Colonial Policy", in the symposium IMPERIALISTICHESKAYA BOR'BA ZA AFRIKU I OSVOBODITEL'NOYE DVIZHENIYE NARODOV, Moscow 1953.

(3) A.F. Sultanov, review of Rashid al-Barawi's THE ESSENCE OF THE RECENT COUP D'ETAT IN EGYPT, in VOPROSY ISTORII No.11 of 1954, pp.150-2.

(4) "The Economic Situation in Syria and the Lebanon", VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA No.9 of 1952.

(5) M. Gataullin, SIRIYA, Moscow 1956; A.F. Sultanov (ed.), SOVREMENNAYA SIRIYA, Moscow 1958.

(6) L.N. Vatolina, "The Growth of the National Consciousness of the Peoples of the Arab Countries", SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.5 of 1955.

(7) V.B. Lutskiy, "The Problem of Arab Unity", SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.1 of 1957.

(8) SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.5 of 1957.

(9) K. Ivanov, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.3 of 1958.

(10) SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.5 of 1958.

(11) PRAVDA 23.7.58.

(12) PRAVDA 28.1.59; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.2 of 1959, Appendix A, p.2.

(13) MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.12 of 1959, index p.21 ("UAR, anti-Communism in").

(14) IZVESTIYA 8.1.60.

(15) Ye. Maximov, NEW TIMES No.42 of 1959; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.11 of 1959, pp.2-3.

(16) Yu. Bochkarev, NEW TIMES No.7 of 1960.

(17) SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.6 of 1960; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.7 of 1960, pp.2-6.

(18) SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.9 of 1960; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.10 of 1960, pp.12-13.

(19) L.N. Vatolina, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.6 of 1958.

(20) B.M. Dantsig, NARODY PEREDNEY AZII (Moscow 1957), p.532; A.F. Fedchenko, ARABY V BOR'BE ZA NEZAVISIMOST' (see MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.8 of 1959, pp.5-9).

(21) SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.5 of 1957 and No.5 of 1958 (note especially the references to "something in the nature of agricultural communes" set up by Kurdish peasants after a successful revolt in the early 1950s, and to "people's committees" set up in Kut al-Hay after a temporary revolt).

(22) MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA No.7 of 1959, p.29.

(23) I. Milovanov and F. Seyful-Mulyukov, IRAK VCHERA I SEGODNYA, p.49.

(24) R.G. Landa, review of L.N. Kotlov's NATSIONAL'NO-OSVOBODITELNOYE VOSSTANIYE 1920 GODA V IRAKE, in VOPROSY ISTORII No.11 of 1958, p.212.

(25) PRAVDA 23.7.58.

(26) Kondrashov, IZVESTIYA 17.4.59.

(27) G. Mirskiy, NEW TIMES No.28 of 1959.

(28) A. Fedchenko and L. Kotlov, MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.7 of 1959.

(29) PRAVDA 3.2.59; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.2 of 1959, Appendix A, pp.4-7.

(30) G. Mirskiy, NEW TIMES No. 8 of 1959.

(31) S. Danilov, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No. 9 of 1959.

(32) KOMMUNIST No. 12 of 1959; shortened version in PRAVDA 17.8.59.

(33) SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.9 of 1959, pp.5-8.

(34) PRAVDA 18.2.60; Yu. Bochkarev, NEW TIMES No.9 of 1960.

(35) PRAVDA 4.10.60.

(36) F. Voloshin, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.7 of 1959, pp.23-4; SOVREM. VOS. No.2 of 1960, p.48; Nihad Kirdar, member of the Kirkuk trade union federation, SOVREM. VOS. No.5 of 1959 and NEW TIMES No.19 of 1959.

(37) TRUD 8.4.60 and 27.10.60

(38) A. Agaryshev, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.6 of 1960.

(39) G. Pyasetskiy, NEW TIMES No.49 of 1959 (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.1 of 1960, pp.6-7); A. Agaryshev, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.12 of 1959.

(40) A.F. Sultanov, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.6 of 1958.

(41) A.I. Pershits, SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1955.

(42) S.N. Bondarev, ARABY V BOR'BE ZA NEZAVISIMOST', Moscow 1957; V. Yemel'yanov, "The Agrarian Question in the Lebanon", SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.5 of 1959.

(43) BOL'SHAYA SOVETSKAYA ENTSIKLOPEDIYA, "Lebanon".

(44) I.D. Levin, KONSTITUTSII GOSUDARSTV BLIZHNEGO I SREDNEGO VOSTOKA, Moscow 1956.

(45) V. Viktorov and I. Sashko, MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.1 of 1960.

(46) V. Rumyantsev, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.8 of 1960.

(47) Y. Bilinin, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.9 of 1958.

(48) Arslan, MODERN TURKEY, Moscow 1923.

(49) A.F. Miller, KOMMUNIST No.3 of 1959.

(50) L. Viktorov, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.9 of 1960.

(51) SOVREMENNYY IRAN (a handbook on Persia), Moscow 1957; GOSUDARSTVENNYY STROY IRANA, Moscow 1957.

(52) N. Vasin, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.5 of 1958, p.118.

(53) PRAVDA 26.8.60; MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.9 of 1960, pp.2-5.

THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Below are reviewed reports on Middle East events appearing in Soviet newspapers during the period 8th November - 10th December.

UAR PRAVDA published in full the speeches made at Soviet-UAR functions on the occasion of the visit to Moscow of the UAR Government delegation headed by Field-Marshal Abd al-Hakim Amir - at the luncheon in the Kremlin given by Brezhnev on 6th December, at the reception in the Kremlin given by Mikoyan (owing to Khrushchev's indisposition) on 8th December, and at the luncheon given by Field-Marshal Amir on 9th December. The speeches emphasized the identity of views of the two countries on the questions of disarmament and the liquidation of colonialism; Soviet aid to the UAR and the building of the Aswan High Dam were applauded; and views were expressed on the questions of Algeria and (at greater length) the Congo. Field-Marshal Amir referred to the questions of Oman and Palestine, and denounced Israel as an "imperialist aggressive base". On the subject of the UAR's domestic policy, he said that its aim of creating a socialist, democratic, cooperative society would strengthen the country's independence and contribute to world peace.

The UAR delegation, which arrived in Moscow on 30th November and left on 10th December, also visited Kiev and Stalingrad.

PRAVDA of 9th November published an appreciative comment on UAR press treatment of the October Revolution anniversary. The UAR press, said PRAVDA, had observed that the big meeting of Communist Parties in Moscow was a proof of "the growing unity and monolithic character of the world socialist camp and the international Communist movement"; in AL-AKHBAR Ahmad Baha ad-Din had called the principles of the October Revolution "a legacy of all humanity".

IZVESTIYA (26.11.60) briefly reported the departure of the Patriarch Alexius and a party of Russian ecclesiastics for a visit of friendship to the heads of the Orthodox Churches of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.

Iraq PRAVDA reported that the Iraqi delegation which visited Moscow for the October Revolution anniversary celebrations, led by Brig. Ismail Ibrahim Arif, were entertained at a luncheon given by Mikoyan in the Kremlin on 9th November and at a reception given by the Soviet Ministry of Defence on 15th November. The delegation returned to Baghdad on 16th November.

PRAVDA (27.11.60) reported that Mustafa Muhammad al-Barzani, President of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan, was visiting Moscow and had had a meeting with N.A. Mukhitdinov, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

A Tass report from Baghdad (IZVESTIYA 8.12.60) described progress made in the construction, with Soviet aid, of a 400 kw. radio transmitter and centre at Saliman Pak, near Baghdad. The Iraqi official in charge of the work said that the new radio centre would be "the biggest in the Middle East".

Lebanon In an article on Lebanese Independence Day on 22nd November V. Vasil'yev, in IZVESTIYA, said that President Chehab's Government had been pursuing a policy of "peace, neutrality and cooperation with equal rights". P. Demchenko, in PRAVDA, spoke of Lebanese protests at US fleet visits to Beirut.

Saudi Arabia PRAVDA (16.11.60) published the messages exchanged between Brezhnev and King Sa'ud on the occasion of Saudi Arabia's National Day. PRAVDA VOSTOKA (15.11.60) published a report of King Sa'ud's speech on his accession anniversary, noting his references to the questions of Algeria and of the Buraymi oasis.

Turkey Soviet newspapers published no comment on internal developments in Turkey during this period.

The subject of developing Soviet-Turkish trade was kept in the news. PRAVDA (20.11.60) and IZVESTIYA (24.11.60) reported statements made on their return to Turkey by members of a Turkish trade delegation recently in the USSR (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.10, p.15). Haluk Faral Ali said that the Turkish visitors were interested in short-term exchanges, whereas the Russians were interested in long-term agreements and in the construction in Turkey of factories, dams, etc. under long-term credits; but he thought there was nothing to prevent the expansion of Turkish-Soviet trade relations.

Persia No reports or comment on Persian affairs were published in the Soviet press during this period. PRAVDA, however, published in full (11.11.60) the Tudeh Party's message of greetings to the CPSU Central Committee on the October Revolution anniversary.

SOVIET WRITING ON GHANA: AN INTRODUCTION

As the first colony in Africa south of the Sahara to gain independence, Ghana has attracted the attention of Soviet writers more than many other African countries. This article can do no more than touch briefly on the subjects dealt with by Soviet writers and some of the views they have expressed in them. Of particular interest, perhaps, is the clear illustration of the change in the Soviet attitude towards the role of the national bourgeoisie in the colonies and newly independent territories which took place about 1955-6.

Dr. I.I. Potekhin The main Soviet writer on Ghana has been Dr. I.I. Potekhin, an ethnographer who is Director of the Academy of Sciences' new African Institute. From the beginning he has written both on ethnic problems and on the liberation movement. His first contributions were "The Ethnic and Class Structure of the Population of the Gold Coast (According to the Results of the 1948 Census)" in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1953, and the chapter "Manoeuvres of British Imperialism in West Africa" in THE IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE FOR AFRICA AND THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE PEOPLES (1953). Together with D.A. Ol'derogge he wrote the chapter "Western Sudan" in PEOPLES OF AFRICA (1954). In 1955 he contributed an article on "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in Gold Coast Colony" to SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.2 of 1955, and to celebrate Ghana's independence he wrote "The New African State Ghana" in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.2 of 1957. Potekhin was keen to visit Ghana to collect material for a monograph on the liberation movement in the Gold Coast, and it was finally arranged that he should spend ten weeks there as the guest of University College at the end of 1957. His monograph has not yet appeared, but in GHANA TODAY (1959) he gives an account of his visit in diary form and includes material about present-day life.

It is clear that Potekhin made the utmost use of his time not only to pursue his studies at the university but also to make contact with leading figures in Ghana and see as much of the country and its life as possible. He called on political figures such as Dr. Nkrumah, Mr. Kojo Botsio, Mr. Gbedemah, Mr. Bediako, Mr. Poku and Dr. Danquah, Mr. John Tetegah, Secretary-General of the Ghana Trades Union Congress, and officials of the Ministry of Labour whom he already knew from ILO conferences in Geneva, musicians, writers and artists such as Mr. Gbekho, Dr. Fiavu and Mr. Oku Ampofo and local capitalists to whom he had introductions. He visited various educational establishments, some of them run by missionaries, Takoradi port and railway workshops and gold and manganese mines and looked at the fishing industry, agriculture and crafts. Potekhin visited Accra again at the end of 1958 as a member of the Soviet delegation to the Conference of Peoples of Africa.

The other two main Soviet writers on Ghana are V.N. Vologdina, who has made a special study of the Ewe people, and Oleg Orestov, Pravda's correspondent in West Africa who arrived there in November 1958 and contributes articles on the current Ghanaian scene.

Ethnic questions Both Potekhin and Vologdina have dealt at some length with ethnic questions and the political problems they pose. In GHANA TODAY Potekhin says that "the ethnic composition of Ghana is complicated. There is not one nation of Ghanaians and there are no grounds for such a nation to form in the future". He considers that there are three basic groups of peoples in the country - the Akans, the Ewes and those inhabiting the Northern Territories. The Ashantis' claims that they or even the larger Twi-speaking group are a separate people from the Fanti-speaking people are rejected; they are all regarded as part of the one Akan people.

Earlier, in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1953, Potekhin had noted that the census showed considerable intermigration between the tribes in the southern region of the Gold Coast. "The existence of puppet feudal chiefdoms and feudal land relations hinders the process of intermingling of the ethnic components making up the population of this region of the Gold Coast, but under the influence of the development of capitalism it develops irresistibly ... There is no doubt that in this part of the Gold Coast the formation of a bourgeois nation is going on." In GHANA TODAY he says that "the towns and industrial centres, attracting people from various tribes, play a big role in the acceleration of this process, which involves, however, only the Akan people and certain minor groups gradually being assimilated with them".

The Ewes, who are split up between Ghana, Togo and Dahomey, though of the same group of peoples as the Akans and with a related language, are recognized by Soviet writers as a completely separate people. Vologdina in "The Ewe People" in AFRICAN ETHNOGRAPHIC SYMPOSIUM I (1956) claims that "an attentive study of the economy and language, material and spiritual culture of this people allows one to come to the conclusion that even before the establishment of imperialist domination the Ewe had formed into an independent people." Now "the Ewes have all the prerequisites for the formation of a nation. They inhabit a compact territory and have one language and one culture.... The struggle against the colonial yoke accelerates the growth of their national consciousness. One of the main reasons hindering the process of formation of the Ewe nation is the absence of a common economy." The Soviet Union has always supported the "just demands and desires of the Ewes" for unification. The result of the plebiscite in British Togoland in 1956, when the whole territory, whose northern part is inhabited by tribes related to those of the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, showed a majority of

58 per cent in favour of joining the Gold Coast on independence, is clearly regarded as unsatisfactory by Potekhin, who says in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.2 of 1957 that "such a division of votes shows that a large part of the population wanted to settle the question of the fate of their people differently, that is to achieve the unification of all Ewes in their own national state. The southern part of Togo, inhabited by the Ewes, expressed itself quite definitely against joining /Ghana/."

Since the population of the Northern Territories is clearly different from that in the other regions in language, religion and way of life and is akin to the peoples inhabiting former French colonies, Potekhin says that "from an ethnic point of view the demand of autonomy for the Ewes and for the Northern Territories can be considered valid", but the Ashanti call for a separate state in a federal constitution was clearly unjustified ethnically and was motivated by the desire of the Ashanti feudal chiefs to maintain their power.

The language problems created by these ethnic differences are dealt with by Potekhin in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1958 and Orestov in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.3 of 1959. Orestov says that "everyone in the country realizes that the alien English language cannot remain the means of intercourse in independent Ghana for ever" but to establish a unified state language is a political as well as a linguistic problem. The problem is aggravated by the fact that the Twi language has several literary forms for the different dialects. Potekhin describes how this came about through feudal rivalries when the missionaries first introduced a literary form for the local languages. As far back as 1945 Dr. Ida Ward of London University recommended that the written form for these dialects should be unified, but nothing virtually has been done and Potekhin writes that "from a conversation with the Minister of Education, Mr. Nilander, I unfortunately got the impression that the Government of Ghana has no definite, clear language policy".

The class composition of the population In "Ethnographic Observations in Ghana" in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1958 Potekhin describes the social relations of the peoples of Ghana as a "complicated mixture of capitalist, feudal, patriarchal-feudal and patriarchal-clan relations". A striking feature is "the high degree of development of commodity-money relations", but this "does not mean a high development of capitalism, still less a high living standard for the population". Colonial rule and economic domination by foreign monopolies hindered the development of national capital, and local private enterprise is represented mainly by cocoa producers with some timber merchants, building contractors and owners of small handicraft workshops. "In agriculture", says Potekhin, "capitalist relations are mixed with feudal"; he disagrees with those who claim that feudalism is absent in Ghana. He considers

that feudalism in Ghana demands special research, since "the lack of clarity in this question makes the struggle of the progressive forces of the country for the liquidation of the consequences of colonialism and the democratization of public life extremely complicated". The task of "abolishing the remnants of feudalism", that is, depriving the tribal chiefs of the political power they enjoyed under colonial rule, is made more difficult by the fact that they are "theocratic rulers" supported by the "ancient religious beliefs of the peoples and considerable survivals of a primitive-communal system". Another subject that needs to be studied is the "big family" with its laws of mutual assistance. Potekhin considers that with the class stratification of society it is gradually losing its power. "Rich people complained to me that relatives overwhelm them. The laws of the big family hinder the accumulation of national capital." As for the working class, figures he was given in Ghana showed that every fifth persion works for hire but "the characteristic feature of the working class of Ghana is the predominance in its ranks of seasonal workers and as a result a great fluctuation and quick turnover in the workers' ranks".

Soviet writers see opposition to Dr. Nkrumah's Government as the opposition of the feudal elements to a more democratic way of development. V. Vavilov, for instance, writes in NEW TIMES No.45 of 1959: "Now these /tribal/ chiefs, moved by fear of losing their privileges, form the core of the opposition to the National Government of Ghana ... The interests of the feudal circles are represented by the United Party of Ghana formed in October 1957 through the merging of four opposition groups ... Though it has no definite programme of its own it attacks the ruling party ... on all lines ... The main target of its demagogic criticism is the centralization of authority, which it represents as tending towards dictatorship."

The independence movement In Potekhin's articles on this subject, written in 1953 and 1954, the success of Dr. Nkrumah and the Convention People's Party at the 1951 elections is said to have "demonstrated the unity of the people and its readiness for the struggle and strengthened its confidence in its own strength" (SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.3 of 1953) but "the CPP, representing the interests of the big national bourgeoisie of the Gold Coast, have betrayed the trust of the people. Coming to power with the support of the people, the party leaders made a sharp turn to the right, to the side of collaboration with British imperialism, and have in effect abandoned the struggle for the real independence of their country." Potekhin continued that "another stage has begun when the leading role will belong to the working class, which in union with the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie will lead the struggle for complete independence from imperialism and genuine popular democracy". In the chapter on West Africa in PEOPLES OF AFRICA (1954),

written jointly with D.A. Ol'derogge, Potekhin quoted Stalin's warning that "the big national bourgeoisie ... 'fearing revolution more than imperialism, caring about the interests of their purse more than about the interests of their own homeland' at a certain stage of the anti-imperialist movement form a 'bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of their own country'".

In his article in SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.2 of 1955 Potekhin's attitude to the CPP is somewhat more tolerant. He says that "in four years in power it has carried out a number of measures creating additional possibilities for the development of the national bourgeoisie", for example the establishment of the National Bank of the Gold Coast. Other measures such as export taxes on mineral raw materials, "Africanization" of the civil service and the development of education "undoubtedly accord with the national interests of the Gold Coast. But Nkrumah's government has not taken any substantial measures to relieve the difficult position of the popular masses". Moreover "the Nkrumah government has begun to threaten with repressions those who hold left-wing views and has taken measures to weaken the trade unions with whose aid it came to power", and he quotes in support of this statement the expulsion from the CPP of Antony Wood, the trade union leader, for his connections with WFTU.

However, Potekhin's article on the occasion of Ghana's independence, in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No.2 of 1957, reflects the changed Soviet attitude towards the national bourgeoisie. "Having come to power /in 1951/," he says, "the CPP continued the struggle for independence with still greater energy". In GHANA TODAY he writes that "now Nkrumah enjoys the well-deserved respect of the peoples of Ghana". But Soviet writers still point out that Dr. Nkrumah and the CPP represent the interests of the national bourgeoisie, albeit the "patriotic" section. D.K. Ponomarev in a review of Dr. Nkrumah's autobiography in PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.1 of 1959 criticizes the book for not reflecting sufficiently "the important role of the working class of the Gold Coast in this /the anti-imperialist/ struggle".

Economic independence Soviet writers constantly emphasize that political independence alone is not enough and that to enjoy real freedom the newly independent countries must also win economic independence. Thus in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.3 of 1958 Potekhin writes that "in the economic respect Ghana continues to remain a country dependent on imperialism", and further that "this dependence means not only the further plundering of the country by foreign monopolies. It ties the hands of the government in carrying out social reforms and in pursuing an independent foreign policy". Potekhin says that the British made Ghana a monoculture country to the detriment of food crops. Money is needed to

develop the latter, but what cocoa brings in is spent largely on the restoration of cocoa plantations since "the British colonial authorities ... did not show due anxiety about measures to prevent tree diseases. And now the young African state is paying for this." Orestov in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.4 of 1959 says that "the first serious attempt to put the economy of the country on national lines was the establishment of a marketing board for cocoa, a product on which the whole budget of the country depends ... This ensures a certain stability of income to cocoa producers." (In SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.2 of 1955 Potekhin described the operations of the Cocoa Marketing Board as "real robbery of cocoa producers".) However, Orestov says, Ghana is not yet in a position to free herself from the influence of the two or three imperialist monopolies which dominate the world cocoa market.

On the need to develop local manufacturing industries Potekhin (op.cit.) says that money and sales markets for industrial production are necessary. But "private national capital is negligible" and "as a result of the poverty of the basic mass of the population the internal market is extremely narrow and is moreover inundated with articles of European and American manufacture. To gain a place on the foreign markets of the capitalist world is a task which is not simply difficult but almost impossible." Potekhin, Orestov (op.cit.) and Yu. Osipov (MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA No.8 of 1959) all stress that Ghana needs foreign capital investments, but that "the imperialists" make very stiff conditions and cannot be expected to act in Ghana's interests. Osipov sees in the delays over the Volta River project clear evidence of the "resistance of the imperialist powers to the industrialization of Ghana". He claims that in two years of independence Ghana has achieved "definite successes in strengthening its independence and normalizing its economy" and mentions in particular the establishment of the Bank of Ghana, the construction of various industrial undertakings such as tobacco and match factories, and the setting up of the Agricultural Credit Corporation. However "the realization of the 5-year plan [for 1959-64] will demand a considerable straining of the whole economy of Ghana. The question of the sources of its financing is particularly acute." Nevertheless he criticizes the capitalist press, particularly the British, which "speaks with scorn of Ghana's five-year plan and forecasts its failure, frightening the Nkrumah government with inflation and other disasters". According to Osipov the announcement by the Rockefeller Fund in March 1959 that it was setting up an office in Ghana to "give assistance in the preparatory work on the realization of the development programmes planned in Ghana" shows that "the imperialists do not abandon hope of subordinating the economic development of Ghana to their own interests".

Foreign Policy Ghana's foreign policy appears to receive the unqualified approval of Soviet writers. On the first anniversary of Ghana's independence NEW TIMES No.10 of 1958 noted that "Ghana has been following a progressive foreign policy based on non-participation in military blocs and friendship for all countries irrespective of their social and political systems ... Its representatives have consistently championed the cause of independence in the United Nations." A year later Orestov wrote in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.4 of 1959 that "the voice of Ghana is yet another voice in defence of peace". As regards Africa Orestov comments that here Ghana does not keep to the principle of neutrality but supports all "the oppressed peoples of the continent against the colonialists of all kinds". One proof of this was the holding of the Conference of African Peoples in Accra in December 1958 "whose decisions rang out as a threatening warning to the imperialists". Orestov welcomes the establishment of the union of Ghana and Guinea as the nucleus of a future United States of West Africa and describes West African moves towards unity as "those healthy tendencies in the political life of Africa in the development of which Ghana undoubtedly plays a big role".

...

AFRICA IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Below are reviewed reports on African affairs appearing in the Soviet press during the period 9th November - 17th December 1960.

The Declaration on Independence for Colonial Peoples

The Soviet criticisms of the Afro-Asian UN resolution on colonialism, as voiced by the Soviet delegate Zorin in the General Assembly debate on 14th December, were briefly reported by IZVESTIYA (15.12.60); it was noted that the Soviet delegation, while approving the resolution, considered it inadequate, although it contained a number of the main original Soviet proposals and constituted a "common platform" on a number of basic questions. It was also noted that the Soviet delegation had proposed an amendment which would "increase the effectiveness" of the resolution; the fact that this amendment was rejected by the Assembly was not reported. The resolution as finally approved was published in full in PRAVDA (16.12.60), which carried a leader applauding it as "a great victory in the struggle against barbarous colonialism".

Congo

The main subjects of Soviet comment during this period were Kasavubu's mission to the UN, the fighting outside the Ghana Embassy in Leopoldville, and Lumumba's escape and subsequent recapture and imprisonment. It is only possible to give a brief outline of the vast mass of material on the Congo which has appeared in the Soviet press.

The UN discussions on the Congo were reported in a very partial manner; speeches by African delegates supporting the Soviet point of view were quoted at length, but the various failures of the Soviet delegation to secure united African backing for its proposals were not directly reported. The matter was indirectly referred to in an IZVESTIYA article of 20th November by K. Ivanov:

> "Justice demands that one point out that the criminal game of the imperialists in the Congo would not have succeeded if in the camp of the independent African states themselves there had been maintained the necessary degree of unity in defence of the sovereign rights and independence of the Congo Republic ... If the leaders of certain African or Asian states continue to apply to the Congo a policy of vacillations and inconsistency, the struggle there will be gravely complicated and new calamities will be visited on innocent people. This is not a reproach, but a statement of facts which are widely discussed by the press of a number of countries and which we do not discuss in greater detail only for reasons of tact. Moreover this is not a condemnation, but an objective conclusion from all the events."

The support for Lumumba in Equatoriale province received publicity; Khokhlov's account of conditions there, largely based on his own recollections (see below, 17.12.60), is of interest in this connection.

The following is a much condensed account of Soviet reports and comment on the Congo situation during this period.

9.11.60 PRAVDA quoted UAR reports that Lumumba was receiving "increasingly active support" from the Congolese people. It referred particularly to support for him in the northern and eastern provinces and Stanleyville.

10.11.60 KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA said that, according to the Yugoslav agency Tanyug, "parliamentary circles in the Congolese capital" regarded Kasavubu's visit to attend the UN as "unlawful" since he had not consulted parliament or the Government.

TRUD reported an interview given to the Yugoslav newspaper BORBA by Sendwe, the Baluba leader, who claimed that the Balubas had a vast area of northern and central Katanga under their control.

11.11.60 PRAVDA afforded an example of the very partial reporting of the UN debates in the Soviet press. On 8th November the General Assembly passed a motion to adjourn its debate on the Congo until President Kasavubu could be present and state his case; this was not reported in the Soviet press. On 11th November PRAVDA said that Kasavubu's mission had "failed", since the Assembly had passed a Ghanaian resolution to adjourn the session until the UN conciliation commission could report on the Congo situation. In IZVESTIYA of 11th November K. Smirnov said that the "US manoeuvre" to get the credentials commission to accept Kasavubu's delegation had been "unmasked" by the Soviet and other representatives, and the discussion on credentials had been adjourned. The committee's approval of Kasavubu's credentials (on 10th November) was not reported in the Soviet press until 20th November; it was attributed to "US pressure". The Assembly's final approval of the committee's recommendation was reported briefly without comment.

11-15.11.60 The main items of Congo news in the Soviet press were the Baluba plan to set up a separate province of "Lualaba" in northern Katanga; the arrest by Mobutu forces of Kamitatu, Premier of Leopoldville province, and his subsequent release; and Lumumba's letter to the President of the UN General Assembly, calling for a referendum in the Congo.

19.11.60 PRAVDA said that in Equatoriale province Lumumba's supporters had intercepted a large sum, equivalent to 600,000 dollars, "earmarked by the Americans for bribery and subversion"; Lumumba had accused the US Ambassador Timberlake of "playing an active role in a vast operation against the lawful government of the republic".

23.11.60 In a PRAVDA article I. Aleksandrov said that the "bandit" attack by Mobutu forces on the Ghana Embassy in Leopoldville and on the UN troops protecting it had aroused "serious alarm" among UN delegations at New York. Both Mobutu and Bomboko, Kasavubu's UN representative, had declared that this attack had had Kasavubu's approval. The UN command itself, "instead of a decisive repulse to the impudent cutthroats", had ended by agreeing to their unlawful demand, and the Ghana Charge d'Affaires had had to leave Leopoldville; the UN command had thereby broken its undertaking that no violence should be done to diplomatic representatives. The activities of Mobutu and Kasavubu had been

made possible above all by US support for "the regime of the terrorists"; it was not surprising that official US representatives had "refused to comment" on the latest Congo events. TRUD (24.11.60) published a Tanyug report of Lumumba's comments on the incident.

27.11.60 TRUD reported that Okito, the President of the Congolese Senate, had sent a telegram to the UN stating that Mobutu was determined, before the arrival of the UN good offices commission, to arrest Lumumba, Kamitatu, Kasongo, Kikwala and Okito; that the lives of Lumumba and other Congolese leaders were in danger; and that a Belgian parachutist battalion was in Leopoldville ready to descend on Leopoldville in support of Kasavubu, Mobutu and Ileo.

28.11.60 Under the heading "Africa protests" PRAVDA published a report by Orestov, its Accra correspondent, on Nkrumah's message of protest to Hammarskjoeld about the Leopoldville events.

29.11.60 Soviet newspapers reported Lumumba's flight from Leopoldville. His arrest and his treatment by Mobutu's soldiers were the leading topic in subsequent reports on the Congo situation.

4.12.60 M. Sturua, in IZVESTIYA, declared: "Patrice Lumumba, handcuffed, tortured, left to the mercies of the unbridled bandits of the Mobutu clique, is a symbol which wrathfully indicts not only those who bear the immediate guilt for the Congo tragedy but also its stage-managers across the ocean, the American, Belgian and other colonialists."

7.12.60 PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA published a Soviet Government statement on the Congo which called for the following measures: the immediate release of Lumumba, Okito, Kasongo and other Ministers and deputies, and steps to restore the functioning of the legitimate Congolese parliament and government; the disarming of Mobutu's forces; the establishment of a special commission to investigate Mobutu's sources of finance and arms; the removal of all Belgian military personnel and officials from the Congo; and urgent consideration of the Congo situation by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The main arguments of the Soviet statement are as follows. "NATO imperialist aggression against the Congolese Republic" has reached a new and more acute stage. With the aid of the traitor Kasavubu, efforts are being made to remove Lumumba, "the head of the Congolese state", and to restore the rule of "the former Belgian and the new American

colonialists". From the US Embassy in Leopoldville "a broad stream of money flows for the perpetration of acts of brigandage in the interests of the colonialists". The object is the further plundering of the Congo's wealth by the big Belgian, British and French monopolies. For the peoples of Africa these events provide a great and valuable lesson - that every step towards independence involves a battle. The "slave mentality" and "quiet submission which still survives in African society" is giving way to the realization that colonialism must be destroyed; for every Congo patriot imprisoned, tortured or executed tens of thousands of more resolute and better organized fighters will rise up. Not all African and Asian states, however, have always preserved the necessary unity in defence of the Congo's rights; their misplaced trust in the impartiality of the UN command, together with misleading imperialist information on the Congo situation, have resulted in these countries not showing the same resolution and unity as at the time of the Suez crisis. The "disgraceful part of the UN Secretary-General and his representatives in the Congo" is exemplified in the fact that they hastened to deny reports that they had sought to stop the excesses of Mobutu's bands and to assist Lumumba - thus revealing their "actual complicity with the colonialists". The threat to the Congo is a threat to the independence of all African states, and the urgency of the Soviet Union's demand for the liquidation of colonialism could not have had a stronger demonstration.

8-16.11.60 Soviet newspapers published reports on world-wide demands for Lumumba's release and on resolutions passed at meetings in the Soviet Union expressing solidarity with the Soviet statement on the Congo.

16.12.60 PRAVDA published an article by K. Nepomnyashchiy entitled "Mr. Timberlake, instructor of the gang of cut-throats". This alleged that the US Ambassador in Leopoldville "found Mobutu's name in the lists of agents of the Belgian secret police, summoned him to the Embassy and imparted to him ideas ... which he immediately began to put into practice"; that "when the gangsters were preparing to usurp power their ringleader called at the US Embassy two or three times a day"; and that the reason why the Mobutu men attacked diplomats from various countries, but never a single US diplomat, was because "Timberlake had become the adviser of the gang of traitors, openly inspiring them".

An IZVESTIYA dispatch from Kondrashov in Cairo reported that Nasir had received a telegram from Gizenga and Lundula in Stanleyville, asking for urgent military assistance for Lumumba's supporters; unless a reply was received within two days "we shall be arrested".

17.12.60 IZVESTIYA published a long article by N. Khokhlov on Stanleyville, who recalled his impressions of the town at the time when Soviet aircraft and Soviet doctors had visited it. He spoke of his conversations on the subject of Belgian colonialism with Yakusu Thompson, the 19-year old editor of the local newspaper UHURU. In Stanleyville, he said, the process of Africanization, "which the colonialists fear like fire", was in full swing, and there was an "anti-colonial atmosphere". This was the district where Lumumba's party had received 90 per cent of the votes in the elections; Gizenga and Lundula and many other Congolese leaders supporting Lumumba had escaped from the "Kasavubu-Mobutu inferno" and fled there. It was significant that it was not the terrorist activities of the Mobutu gangs in Leopoldville which the UN command considered dangerous, but the events in Stanleyville. Whatever the future course of events, Stanleyville remained loyal to the ideals of Congolese unity and independence.

Algeria

On 10th December IZVESTIYA published a dispatch from S. Zykov in Paris, analysing de Gaulle's proposals for a referendum on Algeria. The basic aim of the plan, said Zykov, was "to strengthen a regime gravely shaken by its inability to bring to an end the shameful Algerian war". The repetition of the promise to grant Algeria self-determination was designed to impress foreign public opinion, especially in view of the UN discussions on Algeria, and also to pacify left-wing opinion in France. The object of setting up a temporary system of self-government was to delude the Algerian population and weaken their resistance to the colonialists. As regards the referendum itself, the more "yes" votes de Gaulle received the easier it would be for him to oppose both the left-wing democratic forces demanding peace and also the attacks of the "ultras" against the Fifth Republic. The progressive forces, and above all the French Communist Party, had unmasked the equivocal character of the referendum. Two questions would be put to the voters, one on the principle of self-determination, and the other on the temporary organs of government for Algeria, but voters could only give one answer to both questions. The majority of French people would want to vote "yes" for self-determination, but the so-called democratic system of administration they were asked to set up, composed of persons loyal to the French, would oppose self-determination.

PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA published dispatches from their Paris correspondents on the events of 11th December in Algiers. The participation of the Muslim population of Algiers in a demonstration in support of the FLN was particularly emphasized. S. Zykov asked (IZVESTIYA 14.12.60):

"What weight can a referendum have when it is carried out under the muzzles of machine-guns in Algiers, whose population ... after six years of war, terror and repression is ready as before at any moment to rise in struggle for its freedom and independence?"

On 15th December PRAVDA published the following telegram from Ferhat Abbas to Khrushchev:

> "I have the honour to draw Your Excellency's attention to the mass murders committed in the towns of Algeria by the French colonialists and units of the French occupation army. In particular, in the town of Algiers, in the Casbah quarter, 200,000 Algerians are surrounded by French troops, who are proceeding to their wholesale extermination. Equally grave events are taking place in other quarters of the city of Algiers, and in the Arab quarters of the main towns of Algeria. The situation is extremely tense. In addressing to you the present appeal, we ask you to do everything in order that this overt genocide against the Algerian people may be immediately stopped."

Below the above, PRAVDA printed a Tass statement on the Algerian situation. This said that "the mass murder of peaceful inhabitants of Algerian towns arouses wrath and indignation throughout the world, France included". The "bloody crimes in Algeria", at a time when the UN was discussing Algeria, were a challenge to world opinion and "another distasteful page in the history of a colonialism which has outlived itself and for the complete and final liquidation of which all progressive mankind is resolutely struggling". The statement concluded:

> "Firm confidence is expressed in leading circles of the Soviet Union that, by the joint efforts of all peace-loving countries, the bloody colonial war against the Algerian people, which constitutes a threat to general peace, can be stopped. The Algerian people must occupy its rightful place in the ranks of free and independent nations."

PRAVDA (17.12.60) published a statement by the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions denouncing the "shooting at a peaceful demonstration of inhabitants of Algiers" and demanding the punishment of those responsible. The statement repeated the Soviet view that only negotiations with the representatives of the Algerian people could solve "the crisis which now exists in relations between France and Algeria".

In short, it does not appear that the Algiers events or the referendum proposals have altered in any way the basic Soviet attitude to the Algerian question.

Other Countries

Morocco PRAVDA VOSTOKA (4.11.60) reported that a Soviet trade union delegation left for Morocco on 2nd November for a visit at the invitation of the Moroccan union of labour. The leader of the delegation was S. Nurutdinov, chairman of the trade union council of the Uzbek Republic.

TRUD (17.11.60) reported that, at the request of the Moroccan Government, the Soviet Union had agreed to supply Morocco with Soviet jet aircraft.

A Moroccan mission of friendship and good will, led by the former Premier Ahmad Balafrej, visited Moscow from 19th to 24th November. Soviet newspapers published brief reports on functions in honour of the delegation, which was received by Khrushchev in the Kremlin on 21st November. On 26th November Khrushchev received in the Kremlin a Moroccan military delegation, which spent eight days in Moscow (PRAVDA 27.11.60).

An agreement signed in Rabat on 14th December provides for the further development of Soviet-Moroccan trade during 1961. Under the agreement Morocco will export to the USSR citrus fruits, wool, raw hides, cork, sardines and other goods; the USSR will export to Morocco machinery and equipment, oil and oil products, timber, metals, chemicals and other goods (PRAVDA 16.12.60).

Libya PRAVDA (23.11.60) reported that King Idris of Libya had accepted an invitation from the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet to visit the Soviet Union. The time of his visit would be decided later. IZVESTIYA (15.12.60) published a descriptive article on Libya by Yu. Popov in connection with the forthcoming royal visit. Popov expressed appreciation of Kind Idris's appeal for peace and disarmament in his speech opening the Libyan Parliament; Libya, said Popov, had special reasons for opposing imperialist war preparations, in view of US occupation of the Wheelus Field air base in Libya.

Tunisia A Tass report on the Tunis International Fair (KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 28.10.60) said that President Bourguiba had expressed keen interest in the displays in the Soviet pavilion, and particularly in the illustrations of Soviet reclamation work in desert and semi-desert areas; "this", he declared, "is precisely what we want." He also showed great interest in textile and agricultural machinery.

Sudan On 17th November the Sudanese Ambassador in Moscow gave a reception on the occasion of Sudanese Revolution Day, which was attended by leading members of the CPSU Central Committee (KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18.11.60). Messages of greeting on Revolution Day were exchanged between Brezhnev and the Sudanese President Lt. Gen. Ibrahim Abbud (PRAVDA 29.11.60). IZVESTIYA (17.11.60) published an article by V. Kiselev, "The Republic of Sudan is on the Right Course", recalling the circumstances of President Abbud's accession to power two years ago. The foreign policy of the previous Government of Abdullah Khalil, said Kiselev, had caused great dissatisfaction among the Sudanese people; it had accepted US aid, opposed economic relations with the socialist countries and rapprochement with Egypt and, while pretending to pursue a policy of neutrality, had in fact "revolved in the orbit of the Anglo-American bloc". The Abbud Government, on the other hand, had confirmed in practice its declared intention to pursue a policy of neutrality and independence. It had recognized the Chinese People's Republic and had concluded a Nile waters agreement with the UAR and a trade agreement with the USSR. Its peace-loving foreign policy strengthened the Sudan's independence and contributed to international cooperation and peace.

Ethiopia Soviet newspapers of 15th-17th December published brief reports on the unsuccessful coup d'etat in Ethiopia, quoting Western agency messages without comment.

Kenya Events in East Africa are still little reported or commented on in the Soviet press. PRAVDA, in a short item headed "Freedom for Jomo Kenyatta!" (about Mr. Stonehouse's Commons question on the subject), considered it necessary to explain who Kenyatta was and the cause of his detention. The Kenya Government statement of 13th December was the subject of an IZVESTIYA item (15.12.60) under the heading "a cynical threat". The statement, said IZVESTIYA, cynically advised Africans to put out of their heads any idea that after the February elections the country would be ruled by a government composed wholly of Africans; and it also contained an "open threat" that acts of lawlessness would further delay the granting of independence. "Acts of lawlessness, in the official language of the colonialists, means the struggle of the African peoples fighting for their lawful right to freedom and independence."

Rhodesia and Nyasaland The Soviet press published no reports on the London conferences.

Madagascar Tass (BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 6.11.60) quoted HUMANITE for a report on arrests in Madagascar. Some hundreds of Malagasy patriots, it said, had been thrown into prison, and the municipal administration of Tananarive, in which the progressive Malagasy Independence Congress had a majority, had been replaced. These violations of the most basic democratic liberties were against the interests of the Malagasy people, fighting for the complete independence of their country.

Portuguese Africa PRAVDA (20.11.60) published a long article by G. Bondarevskiy, "The Portuguese colonialists are the fierce enemies of the peoples of Africa". After a lurid description of conditions in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea, Bondarevskiy asserted: "The Portuguese colonialists are using the most barbarous methods to fight the liberation movement; in 'suspect' regions, for example, they distribute poisoned food, which leads to mass sickness and the deaths of thousands of people." Portugal's role in Africa was of increasing interest to "influential circles in the West, who now try to push Portugal into - of all things - the Security Council!"

TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA (1.12.60) published a statement by Mario de Andrade, President of the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola, on his organization's struggle for independence for Angola and the establishment of a democratic government.

Nigeria PRAVDA (11.11.60) reported that Gromyko had sent the Nigerian Premier a letter proposing consideration of the question of setting up a Soviet Embassy in Lagos, and expressing readiness to receive a Nigerian Embassy in Moscow.

The question of Soviet representation in Lagos was mentioned in a PRAVDA dispatch from the newspaper's Accra correspondent Orestov (16.11.60). Orestov quoted WEST AFRICAN PILOT as saying: "The Premier must prove that his Government is friendly towards the USSR and the Soviet people ... The people of Nigeria have nothing against the people of the USSR. Some of us may not like Communism, but this does not mean that we have nothing to learn from a country that has sent a rocket to the moon. We want to have Soviet representation in Lagos." On this Orestov commented: "Nigeria is leading a full-blooded political life. The discussion that is going on is a proof of the growing awareness of the popular masses, who demand that the leaders of the state should listen to their voice."

'Orestov also referred to the question of Nigerianization. Leaders of "the progressive political organization National Vanguard", he said, had demanded "the resignation of the Englishman Stallard, Secretary to the Premier and the Central Government ... who poses as the real Premier, constantly interferes in the running of the country, promotes the appointment of Englishmen to responsible posts and attempts in every way to humiliate Nigerian political leaders". The demand "Stallard must go", said Orestov, had wide support in the country. The Nigerian public wanted Nigerianization of the administration, and also the nationalization of key industries. But the Nigerian public's sentiments of good will towards the government, in its first months of running independent Nigeria, found no response among the government's leaders. "Premier Balewa replied to the friendly criticism in fairly rough tones."

Soviet journalists who visited Nigeria for the independence celebrations contributed long articles to their newspapers on their impressions of the country - L. Koryavin in IZVESTIYA (27 and 30.11.60) and Ye. Dolmatovskiy in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (10 and 15.11.60). These followed the familiar technique of emphasizing those aspects of the country's life - particularly economy and education - which gave colour to the theme of "colonialist neglect". Koryavin said that he travelled to Nigeria in the same aircraft as the student Okonkwo, who "was expelled from a Soviet university for his dirty conduct"; a pamphlet which Okonkwo distributed to Africans in the aircraft, and an article "full of gall and lies" which he subsequently wrote in a Nigerian newspaper, proved that he was "a Pentagon man, bought with American dollars". In Nigeria, said Koryavin, there were still forces which supported the colonialists and acted as their puppets, preserving Britain's political and economic influence, but they were "an insignificant group of people"; students whom he had met in Ibadan were resolved on independence and progress, and with one voice denounced Okonkwo as a disgrace to his country.

Cameroon TRUD (24.11.60) reported a meeting between Moscow trade union activists and the delegation of Cameroon trade unionists which was visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet council of trade unions.

Ghana Newspapers in the Soviet Republics reported the activities of Ghanaian visitors - Mr. Brown, Director of the Department of Education, visiting schools in Azerbaydzhan (BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 29.10.60 and 2.11.60), Mr. Jay Mills, an education official, visiting schools in Kazakhstan (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 27.10.60), and Mr. Edgar Turkson, of the staff of the GHANA TIMES, visiting Turkmenistan (TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 24.11.60).

Guinea A delegation from the Supreme Soviet, led by I.V. Kapitonov, arrived in Conakry on 24th November for a visit at the invitation of the Guinean National Assembly (IZVESTIYA 25.11.60).

Tass reported (PRAVDA VOSTOKA 10.11.60) that Conakry radio had devoted a special programme to the October Revolution anniversary, describing the Russian people's struggle for liberation and their present efforts on behalf of the liberation of the peoples of Africa.

Central African Republic KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA (4.12.60) reported that the President of the Central African Republic had written to Khrushchev inviting a Soviet representative to attend the Republic's first anniversary celebrations on 1st December. Khrushchev had replied with a message of greetings; the Soviet Ambassador in Togo, D.R. Rasulov, had gone to Bangui for the anniversary celebrations. TRUD (15.12.60) reported that the Soviet Union and the Central African Republic were to exchange diplomatic missions at ambassadorial level.

Mauritania Soviet newspapers (29.11.60) published Khrushchev's message of good wishes to Mokhtar ould Daddah on the declaration of Mauritania's independence. In a dispatch from Nouakchott (29.11.60) PRAVDA's special correspondent G. Ratiani said that Mauritania's geographical situation and mineral resources had attracted the special attention of the Western powers; "Western political strategists consider that if after the declaration of the formal independence of Mauritania they can preserve their military and economic positions, then this country could be a watershed between the two basic regions of the African continent which is liberating itself from colonialism."

The Soviet Union's opposition to Mauritania's admission to the UN does not appear to have received any mention in the Soviet press.

Conferences and Campaigns

Afro-Asian Solidarity The Beirut session of the Executive Committee of the Permanent Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization (9th-13th November) was covered by Tass and by PRAVDA's correspondent N. Demchenko. The Soviet delegation was headed by the Tadzhik poet and Chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, Mirzo Tursan-zade. Tass reported that the session had unanimously adopted a Soviet resolution entitled "Mobilization of Public Opinion against Imperialism" calling for a campaign to end colonialism and an assembly of Afro-Asian peoples

in 1961 to further this campaign and call for general, complete and controlled disarmament (KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 15.11.60). Demchenko in PRAVDA (15.11.60) reported that the "General Declaration" unanimously adopted at the end of the session called on the UN to defend the independence and unity of the Congo, appealed to all Afro-Asian peoples to redouble their efforts in support of the legal Congolese government and called for recognition of the Algerian Provisional Government and support for it in the UN debate. It had also been decided to set up a special Afro-Asian Solidarity fund whose governing body, consisting of the representatives of seven countries including the USSR, Indonesia, Morocco and the UAR, would reside in Conakry.

Africa Day In response to the appeal of the Executive Committee of the Permanent Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization, 1st December was celebrated in the Soviet Union as Africa Day. The event was the subject of long articles in most papers and there were reports of meetings held in various parts of the country to mark the occasion. PRAVDA's leading article said that though 1960 could justly be called Africa's Year, since it had seen drastic changes in the map of Africa and the liberation from colonialism of more than 80 million people, there were still many black clouds on the horizon. The old colonial powers and new ones such as the USA used every method to suppress the freedom of the African peoples and prevent them uniting in the struggle against imperialism. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, had shown clearly by its actions that it was a true friend of Africa.

ILO regional conference in Lagos In his message to the first African regional conference of ILO in Lagos Khrushchev described the international collaboration of African states as "a very important factor in strengthening the political and economic independence of those states and a guarantee of their further progress", and assured the peoples of Africa that they could count on Soviet support in solving economic and social problems (BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 8.12.60)

African Students in the USSR

Friendship University The formal opening of the Friendship University in Moscow on 17th November was given prominent treatment in the Soviet press and messages of good wishes from figures such as Nehru, Sekou Toure, Sukarno and Mrs. Bandaranaike were published. The opening ceremony at which Khrushchev spoke was front-page news the following day. Khrushchev said the University had been founded to give workers' children

in Africa, Asia and Latin America the chance of a free education. "Of course we will not impose our views and our ideology on any of the students", he continued. He only asked that they should make the most of their opportunities to help their people achieve happiness. (PRAVDA 18.11.60)

In addition to those studying in Moscow, IZVESTIYA of 13.12.60 reported that students from Guinea, Ghana, Nigeria, the Cameroons and the UAR were attending a Russian language course in Kiev University before entering higher educational institutions. Students from Guinea, Iraq and Afghanistan enrolled in Alma Ata institutes attended celebrations in honour of the 40th anniversary of Soviet Kazakhstan (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 3.11.60).

Anti-Soviet statements by former African students in the USSR Tass (KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 2.11.60) reported that the league of Iraqi students in the USSR had condemned the three African students Theophilus Okonkwo, Andrew Omar and Michel Aiykha for their "lies" about the Soviet Union at a recent press conference in Western Germany. Okonkwo had already been the subject of a long article in TRUD of 29.10.60 by Yu. Kornilov entitled "'Their Man' in Moscow". Kornilov said that Okonkwo had been trained by American officers at a special naval school in Canada before he went to the Soviet Union. He had cut himself off from his people for dollars and become the "Pentagon's man" in the USA's attempt to carry on disruptive work among African students in the USSR. A Nepalese student, Shiyam Dip Thapaliya, writing in KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA of 27.11.60, also attacked African students who had "spread slander" about the Soviet Union in the West, and in particular the Somali, Abdel Hamid; he gave a most defamatory account of Abdel Hamid's character and social conduct while attending the university, and said that he had evidently fallen victim to American propaganda after drinking at the American club in Moscow. (It is evidently the policy of the Soviet press, and particularly of KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA, to seek to blacken the personal character of African students who have given unfavourable accounts of their experiences in the USSR - Ed.)

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group

I N D E X

VOLUMEN II 1960

Abaza, Fikri, No.9, p.16

Abbas, Ferhat, No.9, p.34; No.11, p.29

Abbud, Ibrahim, No.7, p.18

Abdi, Gen.Ahmad Salih al-, No.8, p.13

Abdullah, King, No.10, pp.4-6 and 9

Abet, Ya., No.7, p.17

Accra Conference of African Peoples, No.6, p.9; No.7, pp.12 and 26; No.9, p.34; No.11, p.23

Adamov, A., No.1, p.3

Addis Ababa Conference of Independent African States, No.7, p.27

Aden, No.1, p.6

Adola, No.10, p.23

Africa (general), No.7, pp.10-13

African National Congress of Southern Rhodesia, No.7, p.21

African studies, Soviet, No.7, pp.12-13; No.8, pp.23-5

Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, No.6, pp.10-11; No.7, pp.14, 16, 24 and 26; No.8, p.14; No.9, pp.33-4, No.10, p.25; No.11, pp.34-5

AGIP, No.9, pp.8-9

Agrarian reform, No.9, p.4

- in Iraq, No.1, pp.2-6
- in Lebanon, No.5, pp.3-4
- in Turkey, No.2, p.5

Aid, Chinese economic (to Yemen), No.4, pp.9-10

Aid, Soviet economic, No.3, pp.3-6

- Algeria, No.10, pp.24-5
- Congo (Leopoldville), No.7 Supp., pp.3 and 11-12; No.8, pp.27-8
- Cyprus, No.8, p.14
- Ethiopia, No.7, p.18; No.10, p.26
- Ghana, No.9, pp.29-30; No.10, p.26
- Guinea, No.7, p.19; No.9, pp.19, 23 and 29; No.10, p.25

(Aid, Soviet economic - continued)

India, No.3, p.5

Iraq, No.1, p.9; No.3, pp.4-5; No.4, p.9; No.5 App., pp.12-14; No.8, p.12; No.9, p.11

Lebanon, No.5, pp.8-9

Morocco, No.11, p.30

Sudan, No.11, p.31

Turkey, No.4, p.3; No.8, p.11; No.11, p.16

UAR, No.3, p.4; No.7, pp.6-8; No.8, pp.12-13; No.9, pp.11-12 and 17; No.10, p.16; No.11, p.14

Egypt, No.2, pp.10-11; No.11, p.3

Syria, No.1, p.10; No.11, p.3

Yemen, No.1, pp.6-7; No.4, pp.9-10

Akumu, No.7, p.22

Alexander, General, No.7 Supp., p.15

Aleksandrov, No.9, p.14

Aleksandrov, I., No.8, p.31; No.11, p.25

Algeria, No.5 App., p.14; No.7, pp.24-5; No.9, pp.10-11 and 34; No.10, pp.24-5; No.11, pp.28-9 and 35

Algerian National Liberation Army, No.7, pp.24-5

All-African Peoples' Conference, No.7, p.26

Anatol'yev, A., No.10, p.7

Andreasyan, R., No.9, pp.7-13

Andreyev, I., No.5, pp.4-5

Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, No.2, pp.8 and 10

Arab League, No.9, pp.6-7

Arab nationalism, No.3, pp.6-9

Arab unity, No.3, pp.6-9; No.10, p.3

Arafa, Musa, No.8, p.12

Ardahan, No.2, p.6

Arkhipov, I.V., No.8, p.12; No.9, p.28

Armenia, No.2, p.3

Aroche, Charles, No.7, p.24

Arslan, No.2, p.4

Ash-Shukr, No.5, p.11

Ashur, Muhammad Sami, No.1, pp.7-8; No.8, p.2

Astakhov, G., No.2, p.4

Aswan High Dam, No.2, pp.10-11; No.3, p.4; No.7, pp.6-8; No.8, p.12

Ataturk, Kemal, No.2, pp.2 and 4; No.6, p.13; No.8 App., p.16; No.9, p.17; No.10, p.15

Azerbaydzhan, Soviet, No.1, pp.7-8; No.2, p.3

"Azerbayjani Democrats" (Persia), No.6, p.14

Azikiwe, No.7, pp.23-4

Ba, Usman, No.9, p.28

Baghdad Pact, No.2, p.8; No.5, p.6; No.6, p.14; No.8, p.11; No.9, p.7; No.10, pp.8 and 11

Bagramov, E.A., No.6, p.9

Bahrain, No.8, p.11

Bakdash, Khalid, No.1, p.6; No.3, p.6

Balewa, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa, No.9, p.31; No.11, p.33

Bandung Conference, No.6, pp.5-11

Bangura, Kanfori, No.7, p.19

Bartold, V.V., No.8, p.6

Baskin, V.S., No.2, p.9

Basrah Petroleum Company, No.8, p.13

Ba'th Party, No.3, pp.6-9; No.10, pp.3 and 11

Bayar, President, No.10, p.11

Belgium, No.4, p.7; No.7, p.14 and Supp., pp.1-7, 9-10 and 13-16; No.8, pp.25-6, 28-33 and 35-9; No.9, p.27; No.10, pp.21-4; No.11, pp.26-8

Belkasim, Krim, No.10, p.25

Belyayev, No.2, p.10; No.6, p.12

Belyayev, A., No.7, p.20; No.9, p.13

Belyayev, I., No.7, p.18; No.8, p.12

Belyayev, Ye.A., No.5, p.3; No.8, pp.7-8

Ben Gurion, No.4, p.10

Bilinin, Y., No.10, p.2

Bizerta, No.7, p.25

Boboso, No.10, p.22

Bochkarev, Yuri, No.3, p.10; No.7, pp.2 and 27; No.9, pp.19-23

Bomboko, No.11, pp.25-8

Bondarev, S.N., No.5, pp.3 and 5-6

Bondarevskiy, G., No.11, p.32

Borovskiy, V., No.4, p.10

Botsio, Kojo, No.7, p.23

Bozkurt, Mehmet, No.4, p.11

Britain, No.2, pp.6 and 10; No.3, p.7; No.4, p.10; No.5, p.34 and App., p.14; No.6, p.3; No.7, pp.9, 18, 20 and 22-3 and Supp., pp.4-7, 10 and 15-16; No.8, pp.11-12, 14 and 37; No.9, pp.16, 23, 31 and 33; No.10, pp.2-9, 11-12, 17 and 19-20

Bukedi disturbances (Uganda), No.7, p.22

Bunche, Dr. Ralph, No.7 Supp., pp.2, 7 and 16-17; No.8, pp.28-9, 31 and 34

Bustani, Butrus al-, No.5, p.3

Byeloshapkin, D., No.3, pp.3-4

Cameroons, No.7, p.16; No.10, pp.25-6; No.11, p.33

Canada, No.7 Supp., pp.14 and 16; No.8, pp.32 and 38

CENTO, No.2, p.2; No.5, p.11; No.6, pp.5 and 13-14; No.8 App., p.17

Central African Federation (see also Rhodesia and Nyasaland), No.7, p.21

Central Africa Party (Rhodesia and Nyasaland), No.9, p.33

Central African Republic, No.9, p.32; No.11, p.33

Ceylon, No.8, pp.21 and 39

Chad, No.9, p.32

Chamoun, President, No.5, pp.5 and 7

Chicherin, No.2, p.3

China, No.1, p.5; No.4, pp.9-10; No.6, p.6; No.9, pp.21 and 34

Chiume, Kanyama, No.7, p.21

Chona, No.7, p.21

Clutton-Brock, Guy, No.7, p.21

Colombo Conference of 1954, No.6, pp.5-6

Communist Parties,
French, No.7, pp.24-5
Iraqi, No.2, p.11; No.3, pp.9-10; No.9, pp.15-16; No.11, pp.5-6
Israeli, No.10, pp.10-11
Jordanian, No.10, pp.2-3 and 9-12
Lebanese, No.5, pp.5 and 8
Moroccan, No.7, pp.25-6
South African, No.7, p.21; No.9, p.33
Syrian, No.3, p.6; No.5, p.8; No.11, pp.1-3
Turkish, No.2, pp.4-5; No.4, p.5
Conakry Conference, No.7, pp.26-7
Congo (Brazzaville), No.9, p.32
Congo (Leopoldville), No.7, pp.13-16 and Supp., pp.1-17; No.8, pp.25-40; No.9, pp.26-7; No.10, pp.21-4; No.11, pp.24-8
Consortium, International Oil, No.2, pp.8-9; No.6, p.14
Cyprus, No.4, p.10; No.5 App., p.14; No.7, p.9; No.8, p.14

Daddah, Ould, No.9, p.32; No.11, p.34
Dahomey, No.9, p.32
Dantsig, B.M., No.1, p.3; No.2, pp.4 and 6; No.4, p.3
Davidson, Apollon Borisovich, No.7, p.21
Dayal, Rajeshwar, No.10, pp.22-3
Democratic Party of Guinea, No.7, p.19; No.9, pp.18-21 and 23
Detwiler, Edgar, No.7 Supp., p.2
Dia, Mamadou, No.7, p.17; No.9, p.27
Dolmatovskiy, Ye.A., No.7, p.27; No.11, p.33
Dragunov, G., No.9, p.21
Drambyants, G., No.5 App., p.12
Dulles, Allen, No.6, p.11
Durdenevskiy, Prof. V., No.6, p.8
Dygay, N.A., No.7, p.17

Egypt (see also UAR), No.4, pp.6-8; No.5, p.6; No.8, p.12; No.9, p.9; No.10, p.2

Eisenhower Doctrine, No.5, pp.6-7; No.9, p.7

Enugu, No.10, pp.17-20

Erisci, Lutfu, No.4, p.5

Ethiopia, No.7, p.18; No.8, p.36; No.10, p.26; No.11, p.31

Ewe people, No.7, p.11; No.11, pp.18-19

Fadeyev, L.A., No.8, pp.19-22; No.9, p.25

FLN (Algeria), No.7, pp.24-5; No.11, p.28

Forman, Lionel, No.7, p.21

France, No.2, p.6; No.4, p.7; No.5, pp.2-5 and 7-8; No.6, p.3; No.7, pp.17 and 24-6 and Supp., pp.4-5 and 7; No.8, pp.35 and 37; No.9, pp.6, 10-11, 18-21, 23, 27-8 and 32; No.10, pp.3 and 24-5; No.11, pp.28-9

Frantsev, Yu.P., No.8, pp.3-4

Friendship University, No.9, pp.34-5; No.11, pp.35-6

Gabon, No.9, p.32

Gafurov, B., No.6, p.10; No.8, pp.23-5

Galdzh'yan, A., No.1, p.3

Garmashev, A.F., No.7, p.27

Gataullin, M.F., No.1, p.3; No.5, pp.3-4

Gavrilov, N., No.9, pp.19-20

Genin, I., No.9, p.10

Georgia, No.2, p.3

Georgiev, O., No.7, p.22

Germany (Western), No.7 Supp., pp.4-6 and 10; No.9, p.23

Ghana, No.7, p.23 and Supp., pp.12-13 and 15; No.8, pp.29, 31 and 36-7; No.9, pp.24 and 29-30; No.10, pp.23 and 26; No.11, pp.17-23, 25 and 33

Gholam, Ghafur, No.8, p.5

Gigon, Fernand, No.9, pp.21 and 23

Gizenga, Antoine, No.7, pp.15-16; No.8, p.28

Glubb, General, No.10, pp.6 and 11

Gokbilgin, Prof. Taib, No.9, p.17

Goldziher, Ignatius, No.8, p.5

Gorskiy, S., No.9, p.22

Goykhbarg, A., No.9, p.7

Guinea, No.7, pp.19-20 and Supp., pp.14 and 16; No.8, pp.34 and 37; No.9, pp.18-24 and 27-9; No.10, p.25; No.11, p.34

Gursel, Gen. Cemal, No.7, p.9; No.8, p.11 and App., pp.15-18; No.10, p.15

Gusarov, N., No.9, p.17

Hadid, Muhammad, No.4, p.9; No.5 App., p.13

Hairi, Zaki, No.1, pp.4-5

Hammarskjoeld, Dag, No.7 Supp., pp.2 and 13-17; No.8, pp.26-34 and 37; No.9, p.27; No.10, pp.22-3

Hanna, George, No.5, p.8

Haykal, Muhammad Hasanayn, No.2, p.11

Hitti, Philip, No.5, p.3

Husayn, King, No.5, p.11; No.8, p.11; No.10, p.11

Ileo, No.8, p.38

India, No.3, p.5; No.9, pp.12 and 17

Inonu, No.2, pp.2-3 and 7

Inonu, Ismet, No.7, p.9

Iraq, No.1, pp.2-6; No.2, p.11; No.3, pp.9-10; No.4, p.9; No.5, pp.5, 7-8 and 10-11; No.6, pp.11-12; No.7, p.2; No.8, pp.11 and 13; No.9, pp.6 and 15-16; No.10, pp.13-14 and 16; No.11, pp.4-7 and 15

relations with Persia, No.1, p.9

relations with UAR, No.3, p.8; No.9, pp.11-12; No.10, p.2

relations with USSR, No.3, pp.4-5; No.4, p.9; No.5, p.10 and App., pp.12-14; No.7, pp.8-9

Iraq Petroleum Company, No.5, p.7 and App., p.12; No.9, p.11

Islam, No.1, pp.7-9; No.2, pp.11-12; No.3, p.7; No.8, pp.2-9; No.9, p.23

Ismagilova, R.I., No.7, p.11

Isma'il, Abd al-Qadir, No.9, p.16

Israel, No.3, pp.10-11; No.4, p.10; No.5 App., p.14; No.6, p.15; No.9, p.17; No.10, pp.5, 7 and 10

Issa, Abdullahi, No.7, p.17

Italy, No.7 Supp., pp.14 and 16; No.9, pp.9-10

Ivanov, E. (Lt.-Col.), No.4, pp.10-11

Ivanov, K., No.3, pp.7-8; No.7 Supp., p.2; No.10, pp.4-5; No.11, p.24

Ivanov, M., No.2, pp.8-9

Ivory Coast, No.9, p.32

Japan, No.9, p.10

Jiddah Oil Conference of October 1959, No.9, pp.7 and 10

Jordan, No.5, p.11; No.6, p.5; No.8, pp.11-12; No.9, p.16; No.10, pp.2-12; No.11, p.9

Kaboshkin, V., No.7, p.14

Kahali, Nur ad-Din, No.8, p.12

Kalondji, No.8, p.38

Kamitatu, No.10, p.22; No.11, p.25

Kanza, No.7 Supp., p.16

Karame, Rashid, No.5, pp.6-7

Karev, N., No.7 Supp., p.15; No.10, p.21

Kars, No.2, p.6

Kasavubu, Joseph, No.7 Supp., pp.5 and 8-9; No.8, pp.34-5 and 37-9; No.9, p.26; No.11, pp.24-6

Katanga, No.7, pp.14-15 and Supp., pp.8 and 10; No.8, pp.25-6, 28-31, 33 and 39, No.9, p.28

Katsman, V., No.7, p.22

Keita, Modibo, No.7, p.17; No.9, pp.27-8

Kemal, Mustafa, No.2, pp.3-5; No.4, pp.2 and 5

Kenya, No.7, pp.11 and 22; No.9, p.33; No.11, p.31

Kenyatta, Jomo, No.11, p.31

Kerimov, M.A., No.2, p.2

Khaniqin Oil Company, No.9, p.11

Khayri, Zaki, No.3, p.9

Khayyat, Ja'far, No.1, p.3

Khrushchev, N.S., No.1, p.7; No.2, pp.2 and 7; No.3, pp.4-5 and 7-8; No.4, p.9; No.5, p.11 and App., p.14; No.6, pp.3-4, 10, 12 and 14; No.7, pp.2, 15-17, 19, 23 and 26-7 and Supp., pp.2-4 and 8-11; No.8, pp.11 and 34 and App., pp.15-18; No.9, pp.16, 19, 28 and 31-4; No.10, p.2, 16, 20 and 26; No.11, pp.30 and 34

Kiselev, V., No.11, p.31

Klimovich, L.I., No.8, pp.2 and 4-9

Kocharyan, M., No.3, p.5

Kolesnichenko, T., No.5, p.6

Konstantinov, Y., No.7, p.22

Korniyenko, R.P., No.4, p.5

Korobeynikov, I., No.9, p.9

Korotayev, A., No.3, p.2

Koruturk, Fahri, No.9, p.17; No.10, p.15

Koryavin, L., No.11, p.33

Kosygin, A.N., No.9, p.34

Kotelawala, Sir John, No.6, p.6

Kotlov, L.N., No.1, p.3

Kovalevskiy, Alexander, No.4, pp.6-7

Kraminov, D., No.8, p.37

Krasinov, A., No.3, pp.4 and 6

Krimskiy, A.Ya., No.8, p.5

Kubbah, Ibrahim, No.3, p.10

Kudryavtsev, V., No.7, pp.20 and 25-6; No.9, p.32

Kulibali, Lazar, No.9, p.28

Kurdish Democratic Party (Iraq), No.2, p.11; No.11, p.15

Kurdish Democrats (Persia), No.6, p.14

Kuwait, No.8, p.11; No.9, pp.9-10

Kuznetsov, G., No.2, pp.11-12

Kuznetsov, I., No.7, p.14

Kuznetsov, N., No.7, p.20

Lambton, Prof. Ann K.S., No.8, p.9

Laqueur, W.Z., No.2, p.4

Latif ash-Shawwaf, Abd al-, No.5 App., p.13

Lavrent'yev, A.K., No.2, p.10

Lazarev, M., No.6, p.4

Lebanon, No.4, p.10; No.5, pp.2-10; No.8, pp.13-14; No.9, p.17; No.11, pp.8-9 and 15

Lebedev, Ye.A., No.10, pp.2-11

Leonidov, A., No.6, p.5

Levin, I.D., No.5, p.5

Levin, Z.I., No.1, p.3

Liberia, No.9, p.33

Libya, No.11, p.30

Litman, A.D., No.8, p.9

Litvinov, Maxim, No.2, p.3

Longrigg, S.H., No.1, p.2

Ludshuveyt, E.F., No.2, p.5; No.4, p.2

Lumumba, Patrice, No.7, p.15 and Supp., pp.2, 5, 8-9 and 11; No.8, pp. 27-8 and 31-9; No.9, pp.26-7; No.10, pp.21-4; No.11, pp.24-8

Lundula, No.8, p.38

Lutskiy, V.B., No.3, p.7; No.5, p.2

Lvov, M., No.6, p.3

Lyubarskaya, A.M., No.4, pp.6-8; No.7, pp.22-3

Madagascar, No.7, p.17; No.9, p.32; No.11, p.32

Mador, Yu.P., No.10, p.19

Mahdawi, Fadil Abbas al-, No.9, p.16

Majali, Hazza al-, No.8, p.11

Makarios, Archbishop, No.8, p.14

Maletin, P.A., No.3, p.4

Mali Federation, No.7, p.17; No.9, pp.27-8

Mali Republic, No.9, pp.28 and 32

Malik, Charles, No.5, p.6

Malik, Ya.A., No.9, p.28

Malinovskiy, Marshal, No.6, pp.3 and 11; No.8, p.13

Martynov, V.A., No.7, p.14

Marunov, Yu., No.4, p.6

Mathenge, No.7, p.22

Matni, Nasib, No.5, p.7

Mauritania, No.9, pp.32-3; No.11, p.34

Mayevskiy, V., No.9, p.27

Mboya, Tom, No.7, p.22; No.9, p.33

Menderes, No.1, p.10; No.2, p.2; No.5, p.11; No.6, pp.4-5 and 12-13; No.7, p.9

Midani, Wasfi, No.1, p.7

Mikoyan, A.I., No.5, p.10 and App., pp.12-14; No.6, p.10; No.9, p.33

Miller, A.F., No.2, pp.4-5 and 7

Mobutu, Col., No.8, pp.25 and 38-9; No.9, pp.26-7; No.10, pp.21-4; No.11, pp.25-8

Moiseyev, P., No.2, pp.2-4 and 6

Morocco, No.7, pp.25-6 and Supp., pp.13, 15 and 36; No.9, p.32; No.11, p.30

Mosaddeq, No.9, p.6

Moumie, Felix-Roland, No.7, p.16; No.10, p.25

Nasir, Jamal Abd an-, No.1, pp.7-8; No.2, pp.4 and 10; No.3, pp.6 and 8; No.7, p.9; No.8, p.12; No.10, pp.2 and 16; No.11, pp.3 and 9

Nassar, Fuad, No.10, pp.2 and 10

"National bourgeoisie", No.2, p.4; No.3, p.7; No.4, pp.2 and 5; No.5, pp.3 and 5; No.9, pp.2-5

National Iranian Oil Company, No.2, p.8; No.9, pp.7-8

NATO, No.2, pp.2 and 7; No.6, pp.3, 13 and 15; No.7, p.9 and Supp., pp.2, 4, 6 and 14; No.8, pp.13-14, 26-8, 32-4 and 36-8, and App., p.17; No.10, pp.15, 21 and 24; No.11, p.26

Naymeh, Mikhail, No.5, pp.9-10

Nehru, Pandit, No.6, p.6

Nepomnyashchiy, K., No.7, p.1; No.11, p.27

Nfamara, Keita, No.7, p.20

Niger, No.9, p.32

Nigeria, No.7, pp.10-11 and 23-4; No.9, pp.31-2; No.10, pp.17-20 and 26; No.11, pp.32-3

Nkomo, Joshua, No.7, p.21

Nkrumah, Dr. Kwame, No.7, p.23; No.8, p.37; No.9, p.24; No.10, p.26; No.11, pp.17, 20-1 and 26

Novichev, A.D., No.4, p.4

Novikov, V.N., No.8, p.12

Nyasaland, No.7, p.21 and Supp., p.6; No.9, p.33

Odinga, Oginda, No.9, p.33

Ognev, N., No.5, p.6

Akito, No.11, p.26

Okonkwo, No.11, pp.33 and 36

Ol'derogge, D.A., No.8, pp.19-20 and 23; No.11, pp.17 and 21

Oil, Middle East, No.2, pp.8-10; No.5, pp.6 and 10-11 and App., p.12; No.7, p.24; No.8, pp.11 and 13; No.9, pp.6-15
(see also Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, National Iranian Oil Company, Consortium, Iraq Petroleum Company, Basrah Petroleum Company, Khaniqin Oil Company, AGIP)

Okullo, Stanley Omar, No.9, pp.34-5

Olympio, Sylvanus, No.7, pp.16-17

Oman, No.8, p.14

Onidelo, Kodilinil, No.9, p.31

Orestov, Oleg, No.7, pp.15-16, 20 and 23 and Supp., p.1; No.8, pp.25, 28-9, 31 and 34-5; No.9, pp.29 and 31; No.11, pp.18, 22-3, 26 and 32-3

Orientalists' Congress, Moscow, 1960, No.8, pp.23-5

Osipov, V., No.8, p.11

Osipov, Yu., No.11, p.22

Pakistan, No.5, p.5; No.6, p.3

Palestine (pre-Israel), No.5, p.2; No.10, pp.3-5 and 7

Pavel'tsev, B., No.9, p.22

Peake Pasha, No.10, p.4

Pershits, A.I., No.8, p.8; No.10, pp.2, 4 and 12

Persia, No.2, pp.8-10; No.4, p.11; No.5, p.11; No.6, pp.2-5, 11 and 14-15; No.8, pp.9-10; No.9, pp.7-10 and 14-15; No.11, pp.10-11 and 16

relations with Iraq, No.1, p.9

relations with USSR, No.3, p.11; No.4, pp.10-11; No.6, pp.14-15

Pichugin, B., No.3, pp.5-6

Plyshevskiy, I.P., No.6, p.7

Polyanov, N., No.10, p.21

Ponomarev, D.K., No.11, p.21

Popov, Yu., No.11, p.30

Portugal, No.7 Supp., pp.6-7; No.9, p.34

Portuguese Africa, No.9, p.34; No.11, p.32

Postolenko, M., No.3, p.4

Potekhin, I.I., No.6, p.9; No.7, pp.10-12; No.8, pp.19 and 23; No.9, p.34; No.10, p.20; No.11, pp.17-22

Potskhveriya, B.M., No.4, p.3

Pribytkovskiy, L.N., No.10, pp.17-20

Prokhorov, G., No.3, p.4

Pronin, S., No.7, p.23

Prozhogin, N., No.7, p.26

Pyasetskiy, G., No.1, p.6

Qasim, Abd al-Karim, No.1, p.9; No.4, p.9; No.8, p.13; No.10, p.13

Rachkov, B., No.9, pp.7, 9 and 14

Rakhmatov, M.R., No.7, pp.15-16

Ramadan, Sayyid, No.2, pp.11-12

Rashidov, S., No.6, p.10; No.9, p.19

Ratiani, G., No.11, p.34

Religion, No.2, pp.11-12; No.5, p.2; No.8, pp.2-9; No.11, p.15

Rhodesia, No.7, p.21 and Supp., p.6; No.9, p.33

Riffo, Madeleine, No.7, p.24

Rikhye, Gen., No.10, p.22

Rozaliyev, Yu., No.2, pp.2-4 and 6; No.4, pp.2-6
Rubin, Leslie, No.7, p.20
Rybakov, V., No.7, pp.23-4
Rymalov, V., No.3, pp.2 and 5-6

Sahara, No.7, pp.24 and 26; No.9, pp.6 and 10-11
Salman, Muhammad, No.9, pp.12-13
Samawi, Kazim as-, No.8, p.9
Samusenko, S.P., No.7, p.27
Sarper, Selim, No.6, p.13
Sashko, I., No.5, p.7
Sastroamidjojo, No.6, p.5
Saudi Arabia, No.9, pp.7 and 9-10; No.10, p.2; No.11, pp.7-8 and 15
SEATO, No.6, p.7
Seidov, Rauf, No.1, pp.7-9
Selassie, Emperor Haile, No.7, p.18
Semenov, V.S., No.1, p.10
Semin, N., No.3, p.4
Sendwe, No.8, p.29; No.11, p.25
Senegal, No.9, pp.27-8
Senghor, Leopold, No.7, p.17; No.9, pp.27-8
Serezhin, T., No.5, p.7
Sergeyev, I., No.10, p.15
Sergeyeva, N., No.6, p.4
Shamsutdinov, A.M., No.2, p.2
Shaybani, Tal'at ash-, No.5 App., p.13
Sheynis, Z., No.10, pp.4-5
Shihab, Gen., No.5, p.7
Shmelev, V., No.9, p.22
Shukr, Ali, No.10, pp.13-14
Sisnev, V., No.9, p.31
Skorov, G.F., No.9, p.18
Smirnov, K., No.8, pp.29, 31-2, 35 and 39; No.9, p.27; No.11, p.25

Smirnov, N.A., No.8, pp.5-6 and 9
Smirnov, S.R., No.8, p.6
Sobchenko, A.I., No.7, p.13
Sollogub, V.A., No.4, p.8
Solonitskiy, A., No.9, p.22
Somalia, No.7, pp.17-18
South Africa, No.7, pp.20-1; No.9, p.33; No.10, p.22
SOYUZNEFTEXPORT, No.9, p.14
Stalin, I.V., No.3, p.2
Stepanov, L., No.7, p.20
Stoakes, F., No.1, p.2
Straits question, No.2, p.6
Stupak, A., No.6, p.13
Sturua, M., No.11, p.26
Subhi, Mustafa, No.2, p.4
Sudan, No.7, pp.12 and 18; No.9, pp.27-8; No.11, p.31
Suez Canal, No.4, pp.6-8; No.9, pp.7 and 9
Sukhareva, O.A., No.8, p.6
Sulh, Riyad as-, No.10, p.5
Sulh, Sami as-, No.5, p.6
Sultanov, A., No.1, p.6; No.10, p.8
Suret-Canale, J., No.9, pp.18-19 and 22-3
Suvanberdiyev, T., No.10, p.26
Syria (see also UAR), No.1, pp.6 and 10; No.3, p.10; No.5, pp.2-3; No.8, p.13; No.10, pp.2, 4-6 and 12

Tallal, Amir, No.10, pp.5-6
Tanganyika, No.7, p.22
Tavares, Yaduim, No.9, p.34
Teplinskiy, B., No.6, pp.3-4
Teplov, L., No.9, p.9
Timberlake, No.7 Supp., p.7; No.9, p.27; No.10, p.23; No.11, pp.25 and 27
Togo, No.7, pp.16-17

Tolstov, S.P., No.8, p.4

Tomilin, B., No.6, p.3

Toure, Sekou, No.7, p.19; No.8, p.34; No.9, pp.18-24 and 28

Toynbee, A.J., No.2, p.6

Trade unions, No.4, pp.5-6; No.5, pp.5, 8 and 10-11 and App., p.14; No.9, pp.18, 20 and 32; No.10, pp.12-14, 17-18, 20 and 24; No.11, pp.6, 30 and 33

Tripoli, No.5, pp.5 and 7

Trofimov, V., No.7, pp.17-18

Tsbetayev, O., No.7, p.22

Tshombe, Moise, No.7, p.15 and Supp., p.8; No.8, pp.26, 28, 30-1, 33, 35 and 37-8; No.9, p.28; No.10, pp.21-2

Tsiranana, President (Madagascar), No.9, p.32

Tubman, No.9, p.33

Tudeh Party, No.2, p.10, No.11, p.16

Tunisia, No.7, p.25 and Supp., pp.13 and 17; No.8, pp.31, 36 and 39; No.11, p.30

Turkey, No.1, p.10; No.2, pp.2-8; No.3, p.7; No.4, pp.2-6 and 11; No.5, pp.5 and 11; No.6, pp.2-5 and 11-14; No.7, p.9; No.8, p.11 and App., pp.15-18; No.9, p.17; No.10, pp.4 and 14-15; No.11, pp.9-10 and 15-16

Tursun-Zade, M., No.7, pp.16 and 26

U-2, No.6, pp.5 and 11-15; No.8, p.14

UAR, No.3, pp.6-11; No.4, pp.9-10; No.5, p.7 and 11; No.6, p.12; No.7, pp.2-9; No.8, pp.11-13; No.9, pp.11-12 and 16-17; No.10, pp.2-3 and 12-13; No.11, pp.2-5, 8-9 and 14-15

- anti-Communism in, No.1, pp.7-9; No.2, pp.10-11; No.3, p.6; No.10, pp.2-3
- relations with USSR, No.1, pp.7-9; No.3, p.4; No.7, p.9; No.8, p.12; No.10, p.16

Uganda, No.7, p.22

United Nations, No.7, p.21; No.9, pp.16-17, 23 and 27-8; No.10, pp.4, 7, 16, 20-1 and 24; No.11, pp.23, 29 and 34-5

- and the Congo (Leopoldville), No.7 Supp., pp.1-2, 4-5, 7-8 and 10-17; No.8, pp.25-40; No.9, pp.16-17, 23 and 26-8; No.10, pp.4, 7, 16 and 21-4; No.11, pp.24-8

Upper Volta, No.9, p.32

USA, No.2, pp.7-8; No.3, p.11; No.4, pp.9-10; No.5, pp.3-7 and 10 and App., p.13; No.6, pp.2-5 and 11-15; No.7, pp.23 and 27 and Supp., pp.2, 4-8, 10-11 and 14-16; No.8, pp.10-14, 26-7, 31-2 and 34-9 and App., p.16; No.9, pp.8-9, 17-18, 23, 27, 33 and 35; No.10, pp.3, 5-6, 8-12, 15 and 21-4; No.11, pp.15, 26-7 and 30

Vasil'kov, I., No.1, p.4

Vasil'yev, V., No.8, p.37; No.10, p.22; No.11, p.15

Vasil'yev, Y., No.9, pp.7-8

Vatolina, L.N., No.3, pp.7 and 9

Vavilov, V., No.11, p.20

Venezuela, No.9, pp.7 and 13

Viktorov, L., No.3, pp.6 and 9; No.10, p.3

Viktorov, V., No.5, p.7

Vinnikov, I.N., No.8, p.5

Vladimirov, V., No.4, p.9

Volk, S., No.9, p.21

Volodin, L., No.8, p.25

Vologdina, V.I., No.7, p.11; No.11, pp.18-19

Vosuq, No.4, p.11

Warriner, Doreen, No.1, pp.2-4

Welensky, Sir Roy, No.7, p.14

Workers' movements, No.4, pp.4-6; No.10, pp.17 and 19-20

World Islamic Conference (Jerusalem), No.2, pp.11-12

Yafi, Abdullah, No.5, p.6

Yahya, Ahmad Muhammad, No.5 App., p.13

Yakovlev, M.D., No.7, p.8; No.8, p.27

Yaminsky, P., No.2, p.9

Yasnev, Yu., No.9, p.17

Yata, Ali, No.7, p.25

Yaziji, Nasif al-, No.5, p.3

Yefremov, A., No.1, pp.3-5
Yegorov, P., No.5, p.11; No.8, p.35
Yemel'yanov, V., No.5, p.4
Yemen, No.1, pp.6-7; No.4, pp.9-10; No.11, p.7
Yusif, Awni, No.5 App., p.13; No.8, p.13
Yusupov, D., No.5, pp.9-10

Zaki, Hasan Abbas, No.9, p.17; No.10, p.16
Zanzibar, No.7, pp.22-3
Zelenko, G.I., No.1, p.9
Zhukov, G.A., No.8, p.28; No.9, pp.28-9
Zhukov, Ye., No.6, pp.7-9; No.9, pp.2-5
Zimbabwe, No.8, pp.19-23; No.9, pp.25-6
Zusmanovich, A.Z., No.7, p.10
Zykov, S., No.7, p.24; No.11, p.28

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group

OCT 1 71